DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 387 300 RC 020 279

TITLE	Field Hearing on H.R. 6, Challenge for the Future: Educational Opportunities for California's Youth. Hearing before the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education of the Committee on Education and Labor. House of Representatives, One Hundred Third Congress, First Session (Los Angeles, California, October 4, 1993).
INSTITUTION	Congress of the U.S., Washington, DC. House Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education.
REPORT NO	ISBN-0-16-046062-X
PUB DATE	94
NOTE	85p.; Serial No. 103-89.
AVAILABLE FROM	U.S. Government Printing Office, Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office, Washington, DC 20402.
PUB TYPE	Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Bilingual Education; Bilingual Teachers; Delinquent Rehabilitation; *Disadvantaged; Early Childhood Education; *Educational Needs; Elementary Secondary Education; Federal Legislation; *Federal Programs; Hearings; Higher Education; High Risk Students; Immigrants; Limited English Speaking; *Migrant Education; Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS	*California; Congress 103rd; *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I

ABSTRACT

A House of Representatives subcommittee hearing addressed the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, focusing on Chapter 1 and bilingual education needs and services in California. Statements were received from legislators, Los Angeles educational administrators and teachers, teacher educators, early childhood providers, and representatives of migrant education programs and migrant and Mexican American advocacy groups. Testimony discussed the following topics: (1) state probation camps that provide rehabilitation and educational services for juvenile offenders; (2) the burden on California, and particularly Los Angeles, of educating large numbers of immigrant children with limited English proficiency; (3) the need for programs to help bilingual paraprofessionals and teacher aides become certified bilingual teachers; (4) need for coordination of education, health care, child care, and other services for poor children; (5) the Equal Access to Education Act of 1993, which seeks to expand Chapter 1 from supplementary basic skills instruction to schoolwide reform; (6) changes in the Chapter 1 funding formula; (7) concern that the proposed clustering of federal categorical program funds will exclude migrant students from services; (8) parent involvement and parent education; (9) recommendations for improving migrant education, related to alternative methods of student data collection, consortium agreements, summer program formula, and eligibility; (10) crime prevention and safety in schools; (11) EDUTRAIN, an alternative charter school for delinquent and high-risk students; and (12) problems in providing quality preschool and child care services in poor neighborhoods. (SV)

UD

FIELD HEARING ON H.R. 6, CHALLENGE FOR THE FUTURE—EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR CALIFORNIA'S YOUTH

ED 387 300

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY, AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED THIRD CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

HEARING HELD IN LOS ANGELES, CA, OCTOBER 4, 1993

Serial No. 103–89

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
81-152 CC WASHINGTON : 1994

For sale by the U.S. Government Printing Office
Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office, Washington, DC 20402
ISBN 0-16-046062-X

RC 020279

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan, *Chairman*

WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY, Missouri
GEORGE MILLER, California
AUSTIN J. MURPHY, Pennsylvania
DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan
PAT WILLIAMS, Montana
MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, California
MAJOR R. OWENS, New York
THOMAS C. SAWYER, Ohio
DONALD M. PAYNE, New Jersey
JOLENE UNSOELD, Washington
PATSY T. MINK, Hawaii
ROBERT E. ANDREWS, New Jersey
JACK REED, Rhode Island
TIM ROEMER, Indiana
ELIOT L. ENGEL, New York
XAVIER BECERRA, California
ROBERT C. SCOTT, Virginia
GENE GREEN, Texas
LYNN C. WOOLSEY, California
CARLOS A. ROMERO-BARCELO, Puerto Rico
RON KLINK, Pennsylvania
KARAN ENGLISH, Arizona
TED STRICKLAND, Ohio
RON DE LUGO, Virgin Islands
ENI F. H. FALEOMAVAEGA, American Samoa
SCOTTY BAESLER, Kentucky
ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD, Guam

WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
THOMAS E. PETRI, Wisconsin
MARGE ROUKEMA, New Jersey
STEVE GUNDERSON, Wisconsin
RICHARD K. ARMEY, Texas
HARRIS W. FAWELL, Illinois
CASS BALLENGER, North Carolina
SUSAN MOLINARI, New York
BILL BARRETT, Nebraska
JOHN A. BOEHNER, Ohio
RANDY "DUKE" CUNNINGHAM, California
PETER HOEKSTRA, Michigan
HOWARD P. "BUCK" McKEON, California
DAN MILLER, Florida
MICHAEL N. CASTLE, Delaware

PATRICIA F. RISSLER, *Staff Director*
JAY EAGEN, *Minority Staff Director*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY, AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan, *Chairman*

GEORGE MILLER, California
THOMAS C. SAWYER, Ohio
MAJOR R. OWENS, New York
JOLENE UNSOELD, Washington
JACK REED, Rhode Island
TIM ROEMER, Indiana
PATSY T. MINK, Hawaii
ELIOT L. ENGEL, New York
XAVIER BECERRA, California
GENE GREEN, Texas
LYNN C. WOOLSEY, California
KARAN ENGLISH, Arizona
TED STRICKLAND, Ohio
DONALD M. PAYNE, New Jersey
CARLOS A. ROMERO-BARCELO, Puerto Rico

WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
STEVE GUNDERSON, Wisconsin
HOWARD "BUCK" McKEON, California
THOMAS E. PETRI, Wisconsin
SUSAN MOLINARI, New York
RANDY "DUKE" CUNNINGHAM, California
DAN MILLER, Florida
MARGE ROUKEMA, New Jersey
JOHN A. BOEHNER, Ohio

CONTENTS

Page

Hearing held in Los Angeles, CA, October 4, 1993 1

Statement of:

Fay-Bustillos, Theresa, National Director of the Education Program, Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund; Sally Chou, Assistant Principal, Alhambra High School; and Ronald Prescott, Associate Superintendent, Government Relations and Legislation, Los Angeles Unified School District 20

Genzuk, Michael, Director, University of Southern California Latino Teacher Project; Elva Flores, Teacher, Eastman Elementary School; and Magdalena Arellanes Socea, Director, Migrant Education, Region X, The California Migrant Education Directors' Council 34

Molina, Gloria, Los Angeles County Supervisor; Vicki Castro, Los Angeles School Board Member; and Sidney A. Thompson, Superintendent of Schools, Los Angeles Unified School District 3

Shumsky, Richard Neil, President, Los Angeles County Probation Department Union, Local 685; Carlos C. Barron, School Director, EDUTRAIN Charter School 17; and Pat Griffith, Cofounder, Mt. Washington Preschool and Child Care Center 66

Prepared statements, letters, supplemental materials, et cetera:

Flores, Elva, Teacher, Eastman Elementary School, prepared statement of 49

Genzuk, Michael, Director, University of Southern California Latino Teacher Project, prepared statement of 38

Griffith, Pat, Cofounder, Mt. Washington Preschool and Child Care Center, prepared statement of 72

Molina, Gloria, Los Angeles County Supervisor, prepared statement of 5

Socea, Magdalena Arellanes, Director, Migrant Education, Region X, The California Migrant Education Directors' Council, prepared statement of 54

FIELD HEARING ON H.R. 6, CHALLENGE FOR THE FUTURE—EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR CALIFORNIA'S YOUTH

MONDAY, OCTOBER 4, 1993.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY,
AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
Los Angeles, CA.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:42 a.m., at Dorris Place Elementary School, 2225 Dorris Place, Los Angeles, California, Hon. Xavier Becerra presiding.

Members present: Representatives Becerra and Woolsey.

Mr. BECERRA. We are going to begin this hearing. This is the subcommittee of the full Committee on Education and Labor, the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education.

Today we will deal with a number of subjects, most importantly, the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

I would first like to begin by welcoming our distinguished panelists and guests this morning to this congressional subcommittee here in the 30th Congressional District. I am proud to be joined today by my good friend and colleague, Representative Lynn Woolsey, from Sonoma and Marin Counties in Northern California. Her concern for children and her commitment to education have marked her as a force on the Education and Labor Committee. Thank you, Lynn, for being here.

We are joined this morning by several strong advocates for young people in Los Angeles. Gloria Molina, our Los Angeles County Supervisor, has a long history of fighting for our children and education. Ms. Vicki Castro is a new member of the School Board, but she has long been a passionate advocate for better schools. Of course, Superintendent Sid Thompson, is a top education official in Los Angeles, and he will give us the benefit of his insight and vast experience.

We are also joined by two panels of educators, parents and advocates for our children. Before we begin, I would like to thank our host this morning, the students and educators of Dorris Place Elementary School. Nancy McClaskey, is she here? Nancy?

[Applause.]

Mr. BECERRA. Nancy has been very gracious in allowing us to hold today's hearing in this auditorium. As members of the Edu-

cation and Labor Committee, our focus this Congress is on the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. While today's hearing will cover a variety of issues, I want to focus in particular on two areas within ESEA.

First, Chapter 1, which accounts for approximately $6 billion of the $10 billion in ESEA, and Title VII, the Bilingual Education Act, which provides education services to minority language and limited English-proficient students across the country.

The current Chapter 1 program, while intended to focus money on the poorest students, is spread so thinly that it achieves very little real education. Our Federal expenditures of $6 billion goes to 93 percent of all of the school districts in the Nation and, as a result, many of our neediest children in economically depressed areas are shortchanged.

Politics drives the spread of money, not policy, and California lost hundreds of millions of dollars during the last decade because of inequitable allocations of Chapter 1 dollars. Now more than ever, we need to focus attention on our bilingual education programs.

Here in Los Angeles, two out of five students have not gained proficiency in English, and it is not just in Los Angeles. Nationwide, there has been a 41 percent increase in the number of children who speak a language other than English over the past decade. However, despite this growth, during the same period of time, we saw Federal funding for bilingual education decrease by 46 percent when adjusted for inflation. We must stop this trend and shift more of our resources to these children. Failure to utilize the talents and skills of all of our young people will lead to a failure to compete in the global economy of the 21st century. Los Angeles can and should be the major city for trade with the Pacific Rim and Latin and South America, but we need people who can communicate in languages other than English to be successful.

On Friday in Washington, the Hispanic Caucus introduced the Equal Access to Education Act of 1993, to address some of these inequities. As the Chairman of the Hispanic Caucus' Education and Employment Task Force, I have enjoyed the chance to spearhead the effort to develop comprehensive Chapter 1 and Title VII legislation to improve the education of limited English-proficient and poor children. The Hispanic Caucus' Chapter 1 provisions address the needs of these children with improved classroom practices, greater investment in teacher training, and a strong parental involvement component.

Our bill, if passed, would drive a fairer proportion of Chapter 1 dollars to States like California, which have seen their population of poor children increase significantly. Under the Caucus' bill, our States' allotment of Chapter 1 funding would increase by $263 million. Again, that is here in California. Los Angeles would see an additional $132 million next year.

The bilingual education component of our legislation would streamline the current grant program and encourage whole school and whole district reform for limited English-proficient students. We would increase the resources devoted to teacher training and improve the existing technical assistance system.

We have before us today a broad range of experts on issues ranging from Chapter 1 and migrant education, to preschool services

and gain diversion options. I look forward to hearing from all of our witnesses. I hope to hear some specific suggestions which Congresswoman Lynn Woolsey and I can take to Washington, DC, as Congress considers the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Before I turn to my colleague, Congresswoman Woolsey for any opening remarks, let me advise all of you who are present that the official record of this hearing will remain open for two weeks for the opportunity to submit further written testimony.

Representative Woolsey.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Thank you Congressman Becerra. It is really a pleasure to be with you today and to hear from your constituents this morning. One of the best things about being elected to Congress is that I get to know and work with people like your Representative Xavier Becerra.

I am lucky to be on the Education and Labor Committee with him. I am sure that all of you know how really lucky you are to have him representing you. He is doing an excellent job. You should know that we are not the only ones that think so highly of him. Xavier was recently chosen by the Committee for Education Funding to receive one of the 1993 Outstanding New Member Awards. He was chosen for demonstrating commitment to our Nation's students by advocating education as an investment in the future. Xavier is a champion in Congress for all students, but his voice is particularly strong when it comes to speaking up for the very students who cannot always speak for themselves—students with limited language—English proficiency.

I look forward to hearing the testimony today and working with you, Congressman Becerra, and bring the concerns of your constituents back to Washington.

Mr. BECERRA. Thank you, Congresswoman.

Let's begin now. Let us start with our first panel. They are already seated here. I want to, again, thank the three of them for coming. I know how busy they are. Often it is very difficult for them to make certain events. We are very pleased to have them here because they can shed some light on the whole issue of education for our children in more than just the classroom. So, let me begin now and ask Supervisor Molina to provide us with some opening remarks.

STATEMENTS OF GLORIA MOLINA, LOS ANGELES COUNTY SUPERVISOR; VICKI CASTRO, LOS ANGELES SCHOOL BOARD MEMBER; AND SIDNEY A. THOMPSON, SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS, LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

Ms. MOLINA. Thank you very much. It is an honor to be here and certainly a pleasure within our own mutual district, that is Congressman Xavier Becerra and myself, and it is also an honor to welcome Congresswoman Woolsey here to our community. I am particularly proud that this hearing is being held here—that part of the gathering of information starts here in this community, in order to revamp much of the legislation, but particularly the revamping of Chapter 1. It gave me an opportunity when I was called on to showcase one of the very positive programs within the county of Los Angeles, and that is our probation camps.

Today, as we know, many children in LA County are victimized by abuse and neglect, inadequate health care, poverty and fragmented and dysfunctional family structures. This grim situation is further complicated by easy access to drugs and alcohol and the ever-present gang culture that stands over generations of families. This lethal combination has had a net impact in targeting our children for failure within our school system.

Currently, a large population of children are living in low socioeconomic neighborhoods and are at risk of entering the counties and later the State's juvenile justice system, as a result of drugs, gang activity and certainly other street crime. Without the benefit of delinquency and intervention services, the total number of children going through this system will only increase.

The county probation camp system provides an innovative approach in confronting the problem of juvenile delinquency that can be used to greatly assist our school system. The county probation camp system provides juvenile offenders with a second chance. With a combination of discipline, removal from a negative social environment and counseling, the county's camp system offers a rehabilitation to the juvenile offender. Its success can be simply stated by the fact that 60 percent of those juveniles who leave camp are not rearrested. The California Youth Authority, on the other hand, is almost the opposite, with a rearrest rate of over 69 percent.

The county's camp system consists of 19 camps, with 4,500 beds available. Each year an average of 2,100 juveniles go through the system, all of them because of criminal activity. Also, most of them were failing at school at the time that they were arrested. All camp wards are required to attend school.

The schools in the camp give each ward an opportunity to develop skills that allow them to return to a regular school and succeed. The educational component of the camp system consists of the following: An accredited high school curriculum; low student-to-teacher ratio, 17 to 1, that results in an average of two months of academic progress for each month that they are enrolled in the camp.

Special education programs include English as a second language, GED, and the California High School Proficiency examination preparation and testing and certainly the basic education classes as well. Each ward is given an initial assessment and an individualized learning program. In addition, vocational education classes are available at each facility in various areas, including carpentry, small engine repair, plumbing, electrical and masonry.

The camp system also offers a work experience component that provides excellent opportunities to develop character. Work crews perform various maintenance, culinary and groundskeeping functions. The crews work with the U.S. Forestry Service, the County Fire Department and the Los Angeles Parks and Recreation Department. They perform a variety of tasks, including trail and fire break maintenance, tree planting, and other services. The camp also provides recreational and religious activities.

The cost per ward is relatively low when compared with other systems. The county cost is $28,000 per ward, versus the California Youth Authority's cost of $38,100 per ward.

In closing, each component works toward character-building, the creation of a positive self image, the development of inter-personal skills, and the strengthening of the ability to express oneself in a positive way. It has proven over and over to be a success story for very many young people who were given a second chance. This last year we have had a hard time trying to get the funding that we have always had in the past from the State. This year, with the help of the State, as well as the Federal Government, and the county, we developed a stronger partnership. We need to build that more effectively.

We want to thank the Federal Government and certainly the State for helping us. This is one of the many positive programs that are provided within the Probation Department. Certainly, when we see the success that it has had in the whole area of education, it is something that should be looked upon, as far as funding and opportunities, because it is providing that second chance for many young people.

With me today is Barry Nidorf, head of the County Probation Department, who is here to answer any specific questions, and is also very proud of the program and was successful in trying to get legislators to focus on it and give us the funds necessary to keep it up for another year. Also, Richard Shumsky, who is with the Probation Camp Union, or the Probation Union in the County. They have been working very hard in trying to keep the camps open, lobbying and many times sacrificing their salaries and other kinds of things to make sure that the camps stay open. They believe their contribution to the environment has been a positive one because many of the people who are working in our probation camps give a lot of time and attention to these kids. Sometimes it is the kind of attention they were not able to get in their home environment.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Molina follows:]

STATEMENT OF GLORIA MOLINA, LOS ANGELES COUNTY SUPERVISOR

Today, many children in Los Angeles County are victimized by abuse and neglect, inadequate health care, poverty, and a fragmented and dysfunctional family structures.

This grim situation is further complicated by easy access to drugs and alcohol, and, the ever-present gang culture that extends over generations of families.

This lethal combination has a net impact of targeting our children for failure within our school system.

Currently, a large population of children are living in low socioeconomic neighborhoods and are at risk of entering the counties and later the State's juvenile justice system, as a result of drugs, gang activity and other street crimes.

Without the benefit of delinquency and intervention services, the total number of children going through these systems will only increase.

The County Probation Camp system provides an innovative approach in confronting the problem of juvenile delinquency that can be used to greatly assist our school system.

The County Probation Camp system provides juvenile offenders with a "second chance." With a combination of discipline, removal from a negative social environment, and counseling, the county's camp system offers rehabilitation to juvenile offenders. Its success can be stated simply by the fact that 60 percent of those juveniles who leave camp are not rearrested.

The California Youth Authority, on the other hand, is almost the opposite, with a rearrest rate of 69 percent.

The county's camp system consists of 19 camps, with 4,500 beds available. Each year, an average of 2,130 juveniles will go through this system—all of them because of criminal activity. Also, most of them were failing at school at the time that they were arrested.

All camp wards are required to attend school. The schools in the camp give each ward an opportunity to develop skills that allow them to return to regular schools and succeed.

The educational component of the camp system consists of the following: a few accredited high school curriculum;

- Low student-to-teacher ratio [17 to 1] that results in an average of two months of academic progress for each month enrolled;
- Special educational programs include English as a Second Language, GED, and the California High School Proficiency Exam preparation and testing, and basic education classes;
- Each ward is given an initial assessment and an individualized learning plan;
- In addition, vocational education classes are available at each facility in the following areas as carpentry, small engine repair, plumbing, electrical and masonry.

The camp system also offers work experience that provides excellent opportunities to develop character:

- Work crews perform various maintenance, culinary and groundskeeping functions;
- The crews work with the U.S. Forestry Service, the County Fire Department, and the Los Angeles County Parks and Recreation Department performing a variety of tasks, such as trail and fire break maintenance, tree planting;
- The camp also provides recreational and religious activities.

The cost per ward is relatively low when compared with other systems. The County's cost is $28,000 per ward, versus the California Youth Authority's cost of $38,100.

In closing, each component works toward character-building, the creation of a positive self image, the development of inter-personal skills, and the strengthening of the ability to express oneself in a positive way.

Mr. BECERRA. Thank you, Supervisor Molina. In fact, you mentioned Mr. Shumsky, and Mr. Shumsky will be one of our presenters later on in one of our different panels.

Let me move on now and of course make the mike available to one of the newest members of the Board of Education here in Los Angeles, Ms. Victoria Castro. I want to welcome her and wish her many years of good luck on that board. It is a tough position.

Ms. CASTRO. Thank you. Good morning, Congressman Becerra. Thank you for that gracious introduction. Also, good morning, Congresswoman Woolsey.

First of all, I also want to welcome you to Dorris Place, which also is in my district. So, we share that this morning here.,

My comments this morning are based on 18 years of experience on the front line as a teacher, as a coordinator of Chapter 1 and for the last seven years I was a principal at a Chapter 1 school. So, it is not so much for the 100 days on the board that I am here this morning, but as an educator.

First of all, I believe you must look and address all of the elements of a child in poverty and their needs need to be looked at to succeed academically. I recommend that a greater emphasis must be placed on providing for a student's social and health needs in order to raise academic achievement. Let me give you a couple of examples. It is nearly impossible for a child to concentrate on school when he or she has a toothache. How about a student who is trying to learn to read and does not have the prescription glasses that are needed? I can go on with examples like that. I think that our country can no longer tolerate these kinds of examples in our schools. Although I am optimistic about the President's Health Plan and the State of California's efforts through Healthy Start funding, I believe that Chapter 1, as previously allowed—when I

first was a Title I coordinator—needs to address the health needs of our students.

My experience as an educator has brought me to the conclusion that every Chapter 1 school is in need of an integrated health, social service coordinator, a full-time nurse, and beginning at about grade six, a full-time dropout prevention coordinator. These proactive strategies are needed to address the individual needs of each Chapter 1 student whose school attendance and performance is poor or below average.

The second area that I believe we need to put quality money in must be in parent education. I differ this from parent participation. Parent education to me is giving our parents the skills to deal with the real world their children live in, the world of drugs, gangs and violence that they are exposed to. I think we are always, as educators, promoting the participation of parents; but to actually conduct the courses, give them the skills to help their children deal in the world needs to be—we need to invest in that area.

We must realize and accept that school-based prevention programs for poor youth are important; but, if their home environment is not supported, then we are putting money in the front-end without any support at the back-end. Parents want and deserve real training and education in prevention techniques and skills. I believe that Chapter 1 must do a better job in parent education.

Unfortunately, as the Chair of the Los Angeles Unified School District's Safety Committee, I believe the Chapter 1's funds must be used to assist our schools, especially in the large urban centers of preventing campus violence. In 1990, as a junior high school principal, I remember the pain our school experienced when we lost five students to drive-by shootings in one year. I said enough was enough; but, when I looked for resources to make our students feel safer, I found little. Therefore, I would like to recommend that Chapter 1 moneys be allowed to pay for campus aides. This flexibility would help the school community plan for a safe campus.

I am going to skip—I have written testimony, and I do not want to take up more than my five minutes. In regard to Title VII—in respect to the reauthorization of Title VII, I would like to lay out some facts for your consideration. First of all, California's educational system and the Los Angeles Unified School District is disproportionately supporting millions of immigrant children from across the world, who come to the U.S. for a better life. Secondly, the Los Angeles Unified School District, like other districts in California, service over 100 different languages daily. Finally, the goal of bilingual education is to teach students English.

Your reauthorization of Title VII is critical because of the challenge—the changing national demographics. I hope you will consider some of the following suggestions.

Los Angeles Unified School District and surrounding school districts in California deserve their fair share of Federal moneys. The Federal Government's minimal contribution to our district is an example of how it shrugs at its responsibility to help non-English speaking students to acquire the English language. I cannot believe that LAUSD receives only 1 percent of Title VII moneys. This must change, since we have the responsibility of serving over 275,000 limited English-proficient students.

More specifically, the Federal Government must cut the red tape and bureaucracy in order to get Title VII moneys. If you have ever participated in one of the proposal-writing processes, it is very time-consuming, a lot of effort goes in—and to know that in return, very few of our proposals get approved.

Second, in order for the district to strengthen its bilingual programs, Title VII must support all efforts to increase the pool of available bilingual teachers. I believe that Congress should support two strategies that are effective in increasing the number of bilingual teachers. One, we must invest in our existing monolingual teachers and train them to serve our bilingual students.

Another important strategy for you to consider is the reenactment of teacher core programs for paraprofessionals and teacher assistants. Back in the early 1970s, I successfully completed the teacher core program and went from teacher assistant to a teacher, then to a Chapter 1 coordinator and ultimately now to the Board of Education. In the Los Angeles Unified School District, there are over 10,000 teacher assistants that have been in the classroom for many years, yet they have faced many barriers in becoming teachers, like paying for college education and in trying to become teachers. In addition, there are many teacher assistants that have teaching credentials from another country. They have been teacher assistants for over five years. A teachers' core program can be a positive step for Congress to take to assist school districts to meet their need of bilingual teachers.

I am committed in working to give bilingual teacher assistants the respect and encouragement needed to become teachers and fill the Los Angeles Unified School District need for bilingual teachers. If we can get the assistance of Congress, with the wealth of diversity of languages that we have within Los Angeles, we could probably be a recruitment pool for the entire Nation.

I hope you specifically consider amending the President's Improving America's School Act of 1993 to include reference to the integral part paraprofessionals play in educating our students.

I hope my participation and my comments have helped you this morning. Thank you.

Mr. BECERRA. Thank you, Ms. Castro, very much for those comments.

Let me move on now to the Superintendent. Let me say, before we do that, that I do not think there is a tougher job right now in the world than that of trying to supervise a school district of more than 600,000 children in this day and age in a city like Los Angeles, which is so diverse. Any job is tough; but the job of trying to make sure our kids grow up better-educated is one particularly tough job.

Superintendent Thompson, I thank you very much for being here to shed some light on what we can try to do to make sure that all of our children are well educated.

Mr. THOMPSON. Thank you very much, Congressman Becerra, Congresswoman Woolsey. I did not get a chance to say good morning to Supervisor Molina. Good morning, Supervisor. Of course, Vicki Castro and I had a meeting prior to this meeting so we have already said good morning. I certainly welcome the opportunity to be here. We have staff here to assist with questions. Jerry Jererra

is here for Title VII. We have folks here from the legislative offices and other people, and we thank them all for coming.

History has shown that many intellectually-qualified American youth from so-called disadvantaged areas have never received the most basic of needs necessary to survive in our dynamic society. An education that enables them to use well the resources of their minds has been denied them. Individually, there can be many reasons. Collectively, the lack of opportunity has been the most significant. I think we all recognize that—those of us who have been dealing with it, as everyone in this room, I suspect, has.

Chapter 1. The question is has it worked? Let's ask the question again. Has Title I, Chapter 1 worked? Our answer is yes. Yes. I am aware of the negative research some of which has been done by people with hidden agendas. I submit to you that Federal support to education has worked for the students in the LA Unified School District. Is it ever enough? No. Not for the disadvantages our young people have. Without this we would be in deep, deep trouble.

As I travel around the district visiting schools, at one senior high school the other day I saw pictures of former students that surrounded the hallway. These were in the hall-of-fame showcase, and these were students who had made it, who had graduated and made it. There was a selection process that allowed for only the most representative of the many nominated students to become so honored. Among these are many who became teachers, some of whom have returned to their former high schools and former elementary and middle schools to teach. Some are lawyers, doctors, and judges.

I would like to name just a few to let you know it has happened. William Hector, Postmaster of Compton; Patty McKay, Judge; Donald Ware, Medical Doctor; Jacqueline Davis, LAUSD Business Service Center employee, and on and on. These were folks who had the benefits of that Chapter 1 education, and who went on. Now, if we do this properly, we ought to see more and more of our Latino youngsters who go on into high school, on into college, and then will begin to show the same results as—if we can get the kind of support for the bilingual program we would like to see—they should be able to attain and go beyond everything we have said before.

Perhaps the students that I mentioned would have succeeded anyway, despite their circumstances. I know that because of the additional support of Chapter 1 funds, these students were able to excel.

The experience in Los Angeles has been that the program has helped our students, parents and teachers. We have had over 500 parent volunteers become teachers for LA Unified. Vicki referenced some of that. Several counselors, nurses, one member of the Internal Revenue staff, of all people, or of all units, began as parents or education aides in Chapter 1 schools. Their involvement as parent volunteers in classrooms dispel the mystique of the teaching profession; motivated them to return to school and change their lives and the lives of their families. This has been an extraordinary byproduct of ESEA funding.

At this time in our history, as never before, public education is faced with tremendous challenges. Many of these challenges result

from environmental trauma that exists in the neighborhoods of our cities. I shuddered when I heard Vicki, just as an aside, talk about five young people in one year—five young people in one school who never made it, who are not alive. We talk about the hideous things that our young people go through and why can't they read. First, they have to have a calm and sane environment so that they can learn. That is one of the things she referenced. I am going to add to it.

We are faced with all of these tremendous challenges, trauma that urban communities face, such as having their nine-year-olds enticed to try drugs and thereafter becoming enslaved as drug dealers. We are faced with educating youngsters known as crack babies, who have nerve endings that have been burned out by mothers who have chosen to indulge in any variety of drug abuse during the child prenatal period of development. By the way, that is a serious—I think we all know that from the agencies, but to everyone it is a serious, serious problem.

It is environmental trauma that results in many Title I, Chapter 1 schools being understaffed. This is important. Because, and understandably so, people have fears about crossing the line between what they feel are safe and unsafe environments. Environmental trauma causes students to worry more about getting to and from home safely than about any algebraic equation. These are realities that require more funds to assist schools in the responsibility of educating.

Our district certainly applauds Congress for the continuous reauthorization of Chapter 1, and this Federal support has been essential in meeting the needs of our customers, the children. Parents, students, teachers, support staff, administrators have had doors open and horizons broadened by taking advantage of staff development sessions, conferences and growth opportunities supported by Chapter 1. I would add, we are virtually unable to do the kind of staff development that we should be doing from the general fund, which is supplied by the State primarily in our case. The only staff development that really is of any note is that we are getting from Chapter 1, Title I, Title VII, from these programs. It is our only hope.

Six billion dollars sounds like an enormous amount of money for a Nation to contribute to the education of our disadvantaged youngsters; but, considering the complexities of the task, it is a meager amount to invest when considering that these youth will be charged with maintaining our Nation's place as a world leader. The reauthorization of Chapter 1 is essential if we are to continue to make the strides that we have made in the past and that will continue to be made for this support or with this support.

I would just like to add a few key points and that will be it. Some of them will reemphasize what Vicki had indicated. We would like to ask for these modifications. Allow schools that are no longer eligible for Chapter 1 services to receive the funds for an additional two years, rather than one year. The additional year is needed to ensure stability for the school community as they transition. Because otherwise it is a one-year cutoff and it is very abrupt. Eliminate or reduce the 75 percent criteria for low-income families to a minimum of 50 percent for the schoolwide project which allows

schools to address special needs for all students at a school site. We would submit that the border between that 50 or 60 or whatever percent, and the other young people in that school is typically a small variation, and they could all benefit from it.

Eliminate the requirement for an individual school to develop a new plan when the school becomes a schoolwide project—some of the things that were mentioned again by Vicki. A modification to the existing plan should be sufficient to add in the rest of the students to make it schoolwide. You should not have to revamp the whole plan and go through all of that writing.

Provide funding for three to five years, to ensure stability instead of one, and continuity in the school's instructional program. This allows for comprehensive planning and evaluation and for accountability. Eventually, what have we gotten from all of this is the question.

Remove the requirement for local education agencies to identify low-performing, non-public school and neglected or delinquent program participants. Local education agencies do not have the authority to direct private schools or to direct people who are involved in the neglected or delinquent programs. It is very difficult for us to oversee that. We have no direct responsibility to it.

Establish a waiver process that will allow districts to petition waivers of Federal statutes. This would eliminate the need for the Department of Education to go to Congress to change. That happens every time you want to waive. We can waive currently within the State with State regulations, but we cannot waive Federal.

Permit local education agencies, pardon me, to use a portion of their allocation to fund campus aides. That was mentioned before. I lend my hearty support to it. We are talking about an environment for young people to learn. They cannot learn in an unsafe or an unsecured environment. We really believe that this is necessary. If you get the kids into a calm situation at school, we might be able to address the reading and computational schools.

Allow funds to be used to provide health needs, such as eyeglasses, dental screening, and this was previously mentioned also. I lend my support to that.

Once again, thanks so much. It is just the hard part in this, and I know it is for you, because you have taken the time to come in here—the hard part is to realize that we, as a Nation, spent untold billions of dollars to get to the moon, which we all applauded and there was waste in it and all of that, sure, but we thought that was a worthy goal. We did the same thing way back in my time, before most of you, with the development of atomic weapons to confront Hitler, to confront the Japanese.

I would submit that that kind of commitment to our young people would be a far greater extension of resources than we have had currently and would cause this government to become involved, as its people should, in the reality of what it means to say that our children are our most important resource.

Thank you very much.

Mr. BECERRA. Thank you, Superintendent Thompson.

Let us do this now. We will go into a series of questions that both my colleague, Congresswoman Woolsey and I may have for the three of you before we move on to our next panel.

Let me begin by asking Supervisor Molina a question with regard to the collaboration that may exist between the county government and LAUSD with regard to the coordination of services for those kids who are at risk—those kids who have found themselves in trouble. Can you tell us a little bit more about what you know about the coordination between the two different governmental agencies?

Ms. MOLINA. Well, there is some coordination, but probably Mr. Nidorf could expand—but there is not enough. It is—as I have seen it, it is sort of operated separately. I mean, they are their kids when they are okay; but, the minute they start having problems, they become our wards. More recently, there is this very unique program that has been developed where we have probation officers right in our high schools that are dealing directly with probationers in the schools, assisting them, sort of carrying forward the same program that they had many times within the camps. It is a partnership program that we are hopeful—we have been sensitive to the funding shortages within the school district, but now we are asking for a stronger partnership in order to increase the number. Certainly the one at Roosevelt High School—I cannot tell you the number of times that parents have stopped me and asked me, you have got to continue that program, it is very effective.

Really the probation officer who was there does more than his share. More recently, I saw him conducting the choir, and I kept saying why is he doing that, he should be dealing directly. He is involved with all of the kids, and it is a very effective program. That is one of the things.

We do not do enough planning on the front-end, let me put it that way. I do not think we have worked together and said here are kids that we need to deal with collectively. It should not just be, you know, okay, we educate them K through 12, and while they are good kids, you know, they are our kids. Then, after they get in trouble, they become the county's wards or the court's wards. So, we should probably do more work in trying to plan together and to coordinate. With it, though, we would need to have a helping hand from all of the funding agencies, because part of the problem as well is that the Federal, State and even our local agencies always look at their funding to be—you know, I cannot blame the school district, with the shortages they have, saying wait a minute, that is your job. They are no longer our kids. We have got the good kids to teach and so on. So, there seems to be a resistance to do that. Then, government and its accountability in trying to make sure that the funding is being spent well sometimes does not allow for the kind of collaboration that should go on.

So, I do not think there is enough front-end planning, because you have a tendency to start—because of the situation that we are in where we are all facing such tremendous shortages, you have a tendency to guard your own money, and also to sort of say wait a minute, this is our job, and sort of say that is all we need to do, and so we do not do the kind of effective planning that we should do.

I know that Barry Nidorf could probably expand on that somewhat. I do think that probably the biggest reservation every single time is I wish we could help you, but we do not have the funds.

I think at the School Board tonight, they are going to be discussing that very program, as to how we are going to get the allocation of funds and hopefully expand the program and change the allocation in the various schools. I think basically what I am saying is there is not enough planning on the front end, and there is not enough flexibility within the funding sources in order to allow for that to happen.

Mr. BECERRA. Thank you. Let me—because we want to make sure we maintain a time schedule here, let me move on and ask School Board member Castro a couple of questions, actually just one. You mentioned the use of Chapter 1 dollars for more than just education purposes or direct schoolteaching purposes. You mentioned the integration of health and social services, perhaps using some Chapter 1 dollars to help finance a full-time nurse, dropout prevention coordinators, those types of programs and activities that go beyond current Chapter 1 funding guidelines. I do not think there is anyone who is more supportive of that than the two of us here. I should mention that Congresswoman Woolsey happens to have some legislation on that particular issue that I suspect she will want to elaborate on.

Maybe you could tell me how you would see us being able to use Chapter 1 funds, which are already very scarce for the schooling purpose, for purposes beyond the day-to-day, three Rs purposes that we see right now being used through Chapter 1?

Ms. CASTRO. I think, if we focus on the child in poverty, and our goal is to improve his academic skills, his or her skills, that we cannot look at their educational needs in isolation. We need to look at them as to what their family circumstances are, what their community situation is and, in addition to the dropout and the nurse, integrated social service coordinator on the campus. So, that, if there is some reason why the child is not at their best and prepared to learn, that we have someone on staff that is coordinating with the family to utilize other public agencies.

You cannot address the academic needs in isolation. You cannot deal with a child in isolation. A child in poverty comes with so many needs. We need to maximize the time that we have with that child to improve not only their total day so that they can be successful. That takes working with the family. That takes working with other social agencies. Sometimes that takes the immediate medical needs. It is very common for parents to withhold taking their child for medical need until they speak to the school nurse, because of finances. So, sometimes the first medical adviser to a family is the school nurse.

If Chapter 1 did not exist in some of our schools, we would only be able to offer one day of nursing time. You cannot basically look at a child's academic needs in isolation without taking into consideration their health needs, their social needs. In this type of a program, where we work with other agencies and address the family needs I believe will go a long way to see children succeed academically in this Nation.

Mr. BECERRA. Thank you.

Superintendent Thompson, we have seen some recent reports in the LA Times with regard to the bilingual education program here in Los Angeles. While I was somewhat surprised having read

through the articles that the title seemed to be different from the content of the article. The title made it sound as if our entire bilingual education program was failing. It was actually focused on a few aspects of the bilingual education program.

I am wondering if you could shed some light on exactly what the article was addressing, what you see as the problems and what is being done to correct any problems that exist within LA Unified's bilingual education programming.

Mr. THOMPSON. We appreciate that.

First of all, our history, particularly at the secondary level, and I will be very candid, is not one that you could put a light on and say we are very proud of this. I am speaking of the middle schools and the senior high schools, and I am speaking of the programs that we have for the ESL youngsters, the youngsters who are getting that portion of the bilingual program. You are absolutely correct. When you look at the elementaries and some of the senior highs and the middle schools, the programs are moving very well; but, in others, we had several major, major problems.

These were concerned with the following. First of all, there was the aspect of training. Let me begin with just a philosophy. There was a belief that if you were in a senior high school—and I taught math—if I were a math teacher in a senior high school, I would view an ESL youngster as belonging to the ESL department. Not true. The ESL youngster belongs to everyone and should have access to the core programs. What we found happening was that some teachers said no, he is ESL, or she, and they stay over there, and we will handle the regular math over in this place.

Well, let's just take an absurd example. If you have a youngster who is gifted in mathematics, and they are in an ESL program, they may never see, under that kind of thinking, a core advanced mathematics course. We had many of our people—the State found us in violation of providing, for example, teaching in how to use sheltered English, ways of using sheltered English. They found us in violation of using whatever aids were available to the core subjects. All of it mainly aimed towards our—not inability—but, our failure, and I am being very candid—our failure to bring those young people into the core subjects.

So, we promised the State that we would have a turnaround, that we would begin the training right now, and we are. They are coming in in November to see us again. I will be honest. Of course, there is a little bit of this, but I know that our division of instruction and our bilingual units, and all of our divisions have been working very hard at getting the training out there, at making those changes that ensures that a young person who is in the bilingual program is having access to core subjects.

Mr. BECERRA. If I could just request that you advise some of our offices as well, since, at the Federal level, we are in the process of trying to reauthorize the entire ESEA and within that is the component of bilingual education. I suspect a number of us in Congress would be very interested along with the State and the school district when it is in the process of reviewing the program.

Mr. THOMPSON. I would be glad to.

Mr. BECERRA. Thank you.

Let me now turn to Congresswoman Woolsey for any questions she might have.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Well, I would like to make a statement first.

We had a similar hearing to this in my district. My district is made up of the two counties north of the Golden Gate Bridge, Marin and Sonoma Counties. So, if you have been up there, it gives you an idea of what kind of a constituency I represent. I want you to know that the subject of coordinated services was threaded through the entire hearing. That felt good to me, because you see I came to Congress with the idea that we cannot educate our children if they are not ready to learn when they walk into that classroom.

I am working—I do have legislation. I have Lynn Woolsey words in the President's Goals 2000 Reauthorization—no, Goals 2000, Education Reform, and some funding so that programs that are working can write up their experience so that other programs can learn from that. That is not enough.

What I am looking for—and I am writing legislation so we can possibly have a separate title in the ESEA, and a separate stream of funding. You see, I do not want to take away from Chapter 1, I want to enhance it. I think we can do that. Because these programs exist. What we need to do is coordinate them. I am talking, like you, health care, nutrition, child care. I mean, that little kid that goes to school on their own, mom, dad has gone to work, scared to death, because you are not supposed to send a little kid off by themselves to go to school—is frightened—they are furious when they are in junior high school, and I do not blame them. We are not taking care of them, and not only poor children.

We have working-class families who are—both parents are working, that there is just not time to get these services together. I love it that you are saying the same thing we are saying in my district.

My question to you—because you have answered a lot of my questions I had on this—let's expand it and talk to me a little bit. I am assuming that we agree nutrition, parenting, social services, health care, before- and after-school care—where the school does not have to pay for it, they can provide their facility. The service is there somewhere being paid for.

How about the older kids? I am all for starting with little kids, so that by the time they are older, they are in better shape. We have a lot to do with older kids now. I am very impressed with your camp system. On the coordinated services, what can we bring to the schools for them? I mean, they do not want before- and after-school care. How about tutoring and things like that?

Ms. CASTRO. Absolutely, yes. My comments were based on the older child—my experiences as a middle school, secondary educator. Many of the services that we talked about still need to be there in the secondary child. I think that we need to look at the child's total day. Even the secondary, we have to have that connectiveness at a school. We have to have the after-school program. We have to have the Saturday program. We have to have a college awareness program there. We have to, through Chapter 1, provide for those field trips to all learning centers. There is sometimes not much for our children at an older age to do after school that is productive and keeps them off of the street. So, for us to address the students'

total day, between home and school, sometimes means six, seven, eight in the evening and, for some of our children, 10, 11.

I visited the Salisian Boys Club recently and I was very impressed because many of our students in the secondary go there after school, and they provide for their dinner. They provide for their tutoring, because they know that working-class parents sometimes are not there. So, we have to pick up that responsibility.

Ms. WOOLSEY. I do not think—tell me if you agree with me—we do not have to pick up all of the expense of it. Many families would be willing to pay on a sliding scale just to have these services available to them.

Ms. CASTRO. It is providing the availability of the services—providing a safe place for the student to study. Unfortunately, many of our cuts that we are facing, even in the county, the fact that we have to cut back on library—the hours that libraries are open, and the school is there and the facility. It is being able to offer as many services.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Sid, do you want to add something?

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, I was just going to add, we put three health clinics a few years back on three of our high school campuses. They are major service clinics. They provide a lot of services. They are in connection to some major health provider somewhere in that vicinity. We have seen, in spite of the initial reaction—folks thought we had all kinds of things going, the abortion issue and all that—what we found ourselves into was basic health care. These young people did not—you know, it was nothing as oh, as traumatic as some of the things the press thought it might be or other community people, it was very basic health needs. These young people had not had that kind of care. They just do not have access to it. Here they come with major needs when they are 16, 17 and 18, not to mention even earlier. So, we are all in favor of that.

I was going to add the idea of after-school. That is a major—if I were to wave a magic wand right now from my perspective, I would add two hours to the day for our young people. They do not need to be in the streets. They are in competition at two or three o'clock with what is out there waiting for them. My feeling is—and we have the LA Best Program and some others that are showing this—when we have our young people on campus, I am talking about elementary, two hours in the afternoon, it is not throw out the ball and go out there and kick it—this is about tutoring. It is about showing how to do homework. It is about doing library skills. It is about drama and art and music—that we cannot provide to them in the regular curriculum. So, I am all in favor of those.

Ms. MOLINA. Let me add two things that I think are important. One is the coordinated services. Everyone starts with those intentions. In LA we have a group called Partnership 2000, that is trying to do exactly that. In working with the county, which is probably one of the most stubborn systems of all, we are trying to get our departments to even talk to each other—that is, them to share information with one another—that to go outside and to talk with another local government.

We have done some programs in health care. We have expanded an opportunity now with our Health Department, and we are doing

health clinics within a lot of our elementary schools and other work that is coordinated. It might be worth while to start at the top and force coordination. They become very territorial at the local level. It is like anything else. If there is a forced, coordinated plan at the front in, it might be an effective way of making that happen. Because I think all of those intentions exist within the community. We all start out with those kinds of proposals; but, in the end, when it really comes down to implementation, there is not the cooperation. Everyone becomes again very territorial. So, there might be some effort to look at that process of how we force coordination, and that way that will break down some of that territorial thing, because we will have to work together in order to get things funded, and you are going to have to have that coordinated system in place.

Second of all, I wanted to make a mention about violence in our schools. Right now in our school system, and not just within LA Unified, our entire school system in LA County, the escalation of violence has been fairly dramatic. Again, you have to have a safe place for children to learn and for parents to have confidence of taking their children there. So, that issue does need to be addressed.

Of course, the other part that is very important when we talk about the kids at—in junior high school and high school, I have found—I do not know if that necessarily is the case—that the schools, or for whatever reason, parents start with their kids in elementary school and are very part of the advisory boards and everything else, but, as it moves up, they are not participating. A lot of people say oh, the parents do not care anymore. I do not find that to be the case. What I find is that there is not the opportunity to participate as—the schools are so much bigger when it gets to junior high school, and then three or 10 times bigger when it gets to high school. What it does is starts distancing the parents from their child, and the child starts being treated as an individual unit, as compared to becoming part of the family unit. So, I think we have to be careful with that as well, and look at those opportunities.

I do not know, again—I know this is very limited funds, and I do not want to take away from it being involved in education, but it is a component as well, particularly when it gets to junior high school and high school. It just—for some reason, the parents are not a part of the educational component as strongly. Everybody has been blaming the parents. I do not think that is fair. I do not think our schools are as user-friendly at that level. I think that they become overwhelming for many parents. I think that we should find those ways that we could make them—get the outreach to be more effective and make them more user-friendly for parents.

Mr. BECERRA. Thank you. Let me ask a couple of questions before we do let the panel go.

Superintendent, let me focus on something that is particular to this school we are at right now. Dorris Place elementary school happens to receive a large number of its students from outside of its jurisdiction. It gets them from other areas because of the overcrowding situation in some of these other schools. A good number of these children are poor or immigrant, and would qualify for

Chapter 1 dollars. Either they are not being tested for Chapter 1 to receive the dollars, or the Chapter 1 dollars seem to be remaining in the school from which those children were bused. So, that for Dorris Place, there is a big problem with trying to maintain a high level of education in a school where many of the kids would otherwise qualify for Chapter 1 funding, but the school is not receiving the dollars. Any thoughts on that situation that Dorris Place is in?

Mr. THOMPSON. We have had that question raised a number of times. As I understand it, and I am looking towards my people—Pauline, why don't you come up.

Mr. BECERRA. There is a microphone to the left.

Mr. THOMPSON. The money is specific to the school and not to the youngster. That is primarily the problem. I am going to ask Pauline to come down and reference it.

Mr. BECERRA. Before, of course, you begin, let me make sure we ask our principal to please come up, Ms. McClaskey—is she still here—if she would also come up, in the event that she may have some thoughts as well.

Mr. THOMPSON. Pauline Hopper heads our Compensatory Education Programs. Pauline, maybe you would like to respond.

Ms. HOPPER. Mr. Becerra, my regards to you. The legislation, as it stands today prohibits money following a child. That is really what we are talking about. When we cap a school, we have said it is overcrowded, and the door is locked. So, when Pauline comes up to enter the school, she is sent over here, over here, and over here. If we change the legislation to read that money can follow the child. See, we—you said to test the child. We have not seen the child at the school that has been identified.

We rank from the highest concentration of poverty to the lowest. As I am reading some of the recommendations from our President, he wants to expand that, whereby, some schools that are now in the program, as I see it, will not be, because he is using a schoolwide project approach, which means, if Dorris Place happened to have ranked in high enough, everyone in Dorris Place would be served. There is not a school in the City of Los Angeles that is totally eligible for Chapter 1. Poverty is the first ranking. You rank the schools, then you kick-in with those that receive the service. They have to be educationally-deprived. There are two criteria. There are two—because they are just not.

I received a letter that you received—is that a district, no. It says that 5 percent in the school—in the innovative projects could be used, if it was in our desegregation plan, which it is not, where money would follow the child. I think legislation that would take care of that—because it is easy for—and Mary Jane LaTron really wrote a good fair answer to the letter, because I analyzed it closely. We need to change the legislation.

May I say—I am taking advantage of the situation.

Mr. BECERRA. Take advantage.

Ms. HOPPER. May I say something to you? Once you write legislation, there is a whole group of folks called the Department of Education, and they give a wide—they tell you it is innovation, it is flexibility. I do not know what flexibility means when they tell me I cannot do this. I called because we had a big audit and I hap-

pened to have fallen in line and still suffer from nervous eczema from it, and it has been over seven years ago, and this is true.

Mr. THOMPSON. You do get your points in.

Ms. HOPPER. I am saying that the guidelines sometimes are not the intent of those that make the law. We need to monitor that closely. Then I go back and say at the State. They will put another bite into us. I know what Dorris Place is faced with. Once we cap and children come in, they are not in that ranking. If we took the money away, the children that were in the school, and it is all done a year before, they are there and the door is locked. Are we to take it from them?

I think the legislation needs to be changed.

Mr. BECERRA. Thank you. Thank you for the insight.

I do not know if Ms. McClaskey would like to say anything in regards to the issue.

Ms. MCCLASKEY. I feel that Ms. Hopper expressed it very well. It is a concern not only to Dorris Place, but also to other schools in our district which receive what we call cap students, Capacity Adjustment Program students. Thank you.

Mr. BECERRA. Thank you. I will just mention. Obviously, I know the Superintendent knows this, and some of the individuals, Mr. Prescott and others, with whom we have been working closely with know this—but I would offer the services of the congressional offices—either your representative or not, to please make sure you are communicating some of your ideas on specific language. Because oftentimes we hear the problem, and we think we come up with the language to resolve it and we find we do not. It is too late after it passes for you all to provide the input. So, please—I know the Superintendent knows this; but, please make sure you have provided to us what you believe would be the best way to draft the language on that legislation.

Ms. HOPPER. If there were one item that Mr. Thompson identified—the State of California allows us to waive any part of the code. I feel that there should be some—not going against what you are doing—but some provision where a local school district or State could ask for a waiver as—because things will occur as you go on, and that one thing that you spoke to, Mr. Thompson, really is important.

Mr. BECERRA. That is already in some of the legislation that is being drafted out of Congress in the Goals 2000 legislation, because we are talking about trying to provide more flexibility. There is some of that there. I must tell you, there is always a concern that if we provide too much latitude that the waiver will be taken advantage of, and that is where you want to have that oversight.

Ms. HOPPER. It would still come through your Department of Education, and then we must be held accountable.

Mr. BECERRA. Right.

Ms. HOPPER. So, I think it would wash itself.

Mr. BECERRA. Point well taken. Point very well taken. Let me now move on and thank our panelists for having come, especially those who are always very busy. We do thank both Superintendent Thompson, School Board member Castro and Supervisor Molina for taking the time to be here. Thank you very much. Please enjoy the rest of your day.

[Applause.]

Mr. BECERRA. We will have a brief break, as we prepare for our next panel of witnesses. Since we have a small table, what I am going to ask is that the first three individuals listed on our second panel, and that would be Theresa Fay-Bustillos, from MALDEF; Mr. Ron Prescott, from LA Unified; and Ms. Sally Chou, Assistant Principal from Alhambra High, please come up to the podium.

[Recess.]

Mr. BECERRA. Please take your seats. We would like to proceed with the hearing. We have a full agenda, so we would like to go ahead and proceed, if everyone would please take their seats. If I could have everyone who is in the back of the room please take their seats, so we can go ahead and proceed? Everyone in the back, I would appreciate it—if you have a conversation going on, please, if you would step outside so we could proceed with the hearing. We would appreciate that very very much.

Our next panel will deal directly with the issue of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. We have six people on the panel. The first three are here with us before us ready to provide their testimony. Let me begin by introducing Ms. Theresa Fay-Bustillos, who happens to be an attorney with the Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund, someone who works on educational issues, and actually was quite instrumental in the drafting of the bill that the Hispanic Caucus introduced recently on ESEA. I would like to thank Theresa for taking the time to be here and welcome her here.

STATEMENTS OF THERESA FAY-BUSTILLOS, NATIONAL DIRECTOR OF THE EDUCATION PROGRAM, MEXICAN AMERICAN LEGAL DEFENSE AND EDUCATION FUND; SALLY CHOU, ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL, ALHAMBRA HIGH SCHOOL; AND RONALD PRESCOTT, ASSOCIATE SUPERINTENDENT, GOVERNMENT RELATIONS AND LEGISLATION, LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

Ms. FAY-BUSTILLOS. Thank you very much. I want to start by answering a question that Sid left off with. Sid and I agree on our priorities, and that is children. However, we often disagree on how to reach the ultimate goal of improving the educational system for children. So, I want to start by answering a question that he asked and answered himself at the end of his presentation. That question is is Chapter 1 working? I say no, it has not. Has it been effective? Yes. I am going to explain why there is a difference and an important distinction between those two questions.

It has not been working because national evaluations of the program not conducted by special interest groups, but conducted by the U.S. Department of Education, have shown that the typical Chapter 1 program is a pull-out program, where about six students are taken away from the regular instruction, miss regular instruction, are given supplemental instruction for about 30 minutes per day by an aide—a very well-meaning, very dedicated aide, but nonetheless, 80 percent of aides do not even have a bachelor's degree. During this 30 minutes, they are given basic school drilling. Now, that does not prepare one to go to the University of California alone.

In high poverty districts, a typical Chapter 1 program is a combination of a pull-out instruction program and in-class services. Who are the in-class services provided by? By the teacher? No. The in-class services are provided again by aides.

MALDEF's own personal experience in working with the LA Unified School District—we sued the district, and we have a lot of experience and a lot of knowledge with—about what goes on at the district—is that a lot of the money goes into the budget for the Chapter 1 school. A lot of schools are almost universally Chapter 1. The money goes into the budget, and it is used at that school to help the Chapter 1 students, but, nonetheless, it goes into the budget, and we are not clear exactly where that money is actually going.

In Chicago we sued the school district because they used Chapter 1 funds to balance the budget. So, is Chapter 1 working? No.

Now, how has it been effective? Because it has been effective. It has been effective in improving the basic skills of children. As I started off earlier, if you want a job in the kind of industry that is going to come to California in the future, it is not going to be having basic skills. If you want to go to the University of California, it is not just having basic skills, you have got to know a lot more. Chapter 1 has not been successful—has not worked at all in closing the achievement gap between the poor and others. It has not done anything for Latinos and their spiraling dropout rates. We lead the Nation in dropout rates in this country. Has Chapter 1 had an impact on that? No.

What I want to talk about today is I want to talk about support for what the Congressional Hispanic Caucus has done. On Friday, as Mr. Becerra indicated, they introduced the Equal Access to Education Act of 1993. This bill does have the potential to make Chapter 1 work, not just be effective in improving basic skills instruction, but to actually make Chapter 1 program work to prepare our low-income children, to prepare Latino youth in order to have the job of the 21st century, to be able to go to college, to have opportunities in life, to have choices. This bill provides that legislative framework. That is what I want to talk about very quickly here today.

I did prepare extensive testimony, and it is available.

The bill comprises—there are five basic elements to the bill, if I could quickly summarize it. The first is the institution of schoolwide reform. The reason why you need schoolwide reform is because you cannot just address a problem so basic as the failure of our educational system to really close that achievement gap by providing a 30-minute instruction program or by providing some supplemental instruction by an aide. You have got to change that whole school. You have got to make sure the entire school, from top to bottom, is committed to innovative educational techniques and really teach and reach these children. You have got to make sure that the whole school is responsible for improving those educational outcomes, not just an aide. That is why you need schoolwide reform.

The schoolwide reform is comprised of various elements. I am going to go through it. One of the things that the bill does is it sets forth State contents standards. You need to have a system that

says parents, teachers, educators, this is what every child in this State should know. This is what it is in every subject in this State, and not just every core academic subject, but you have got to start stressing the acquisition of a second language. That is something that the bill does. In California, if we are going to be competitive in the global economy, we have got to speak more than English.

The bill also addresses arts and community service as well. You have got to have contents standards that says this is what in California or any State we want our children to know. That is one thing the State requires—that the bill requires.

It also sets out performance standards. You have got to be able to assess students. How well are they performing up against these contents standards? The current legislation just assesses how well students are performing against each other.

I think universally we feel that the educational system is not doing very well, so what is that telling us? Very little. You have got to say this is what we want and this is how you, students are performing up against that contents standard, and that is what the bill has in it. It also sets up an opportunity to learn standards. It is completely and patently unfair to hold schools, to hold teachers, to hold aides, to hold principals accountable for improving educational outcomes unless you give them the tools and the resources to do that. The bill sets out and specifies exactly what those tools and resources are. We heard a lot of them discussed on the prior panel.

The bill also requires school districts to establish local standards. I will tell you why local standards are important. We heard a little glimpse of it today. That is, there is often a tension between school districts and State educational agencies. I think that tension sometimes is helpful. If you are going to have States setting up content, performance and opportunity to learn standards, you then have got to have school districts and schools that buy into all of these standards. The way to have them buy-in is to make sure there are local standards that comply with the State standards. So, the local standards are important to make sure that every parent at that school, every parent in that district understands and buys into all of these State standards. That is why you develop and have local standards.

You are also going to have schoolwide achievement plans. Every school and district is going to have an achievement plan. These plans differ from the plans currently being developed under Chapter 1 because they require an analysis of student achievement patterns, but they require it broken down by race, national origin, gender, limited English-proficient status, economic disadvantage and other. It also requires an analysis of other measures, such as grade-level retentions and the dropout rate. Let's monitor how the different ethnic groups—how poor children are doing on their dropout rates. It also looks at discipline rates. Because we know from our own work that Latinos and African Americans are subject disproportionately to school discipline. So, it requires school and districts to look at those rates by race, ethnicity, gender, and every other criteria.

It also requires the schools and the districts to address and talk about all of the steps they are going to take to improve and meet

the educational outcomes for the students. It requires them to address—if they see any particular group having a disproportionate increase in discipline, grade level retention, dropouts, what are you going to do to address that for those groups of students. So, it requires them to monitor this and then set up a system to address it.

Most importantly, the bill has extensive professional development, parent-involvement provisions and all of these school plans will contain plans for the professional development and parent involvement. The professional development is a key provision in this bill. Because, if you are going to require teachers and aides, and principals to have new roles, such as, in redesigning curriculum, in using innovative, new instructional approaches to these children, in requiring and getting all children to learn higher-order thinking skills, critical thinking skills, team teaching, if you are going to require all of these things on professionals in the school, then you have got to provide the resources and training that they are going to need in order to meet those new roles. So, what the bill does is it has a set-aside for professional development. It starts off at 10 percent of the bill, and then it goes up to 20 percent. That is to make sure that this money is directed at the people in the school that can have the biggest impact, and they can.

I am talking as fast as I can. It also requires a whole new assessment system. We have heard a little bit about the assessment system and how it has not worked. What the new assessment system does is it requires you to be able to monitor how students are doing against the new standards. It also helps to allow the teachers to know an individual classroom—how individual students are doing, so that parents can know how the individual students are doing. It requires at least one meeting per year with the parents so that they can know how all of the students in the school are doing. It also has different provisions to hold the Chapter 1 program accountable nationally, to hold the progress of schools accountable and to hold the State accountable. All of these are built in to the new assessment system.

Most importantly, it assures linguistic assessability, so no longer are you going to have limited English-proficient students excluded from testing because there is no assessment instrument available in order to test their content, knowledge and proficiency in English.

Last, it has a whole new approach to parent involvement. We have heard a lot about how parent involvement has not gone far enough. The bill has a whole new approach to parent involvement that really emphasizes parents taking a role for themselves—a leadership role for themselves, setting up their own parent organizations, extensive training mechanisms for parents, and it also has another set-aside. Because, if parents are important, then you have got to make sure that money is driven to those activities, and makes sure it happens. It also requires every LEA, or school district to set up a local parent resource center.

The next big point are health and social services. It also requires staff to be used to integrate health and social services. Everything we heard about earlier is included in this bill. There is money set aside for staff to coordinate the colocation to coordinate the provision of health and social services at the school site. The money in

the bill is not to be used for the direct delivery of these, but for the integration of those at the school and the district level. It also requires the governor and the States to take a leadership role in developing a plan, so that it is, from on high, a plan that requires the integration of health and social services.

It also requires that States and districts assure that the comparability of educational services is based upon comparable need. It also eliminates the prohibition that was there before which was a bar to limited English-proficient students being adequately served by the bill.

Last, on accountability. The current legislation focuses accountability on expenditure of dollars and punishes improvement by withdrawing dollars when schools improve. Under the Caucus bill, funds are driven to the school based on solely the number of poor students. You no longer have to fail a test in order to be eligible for Chapter 1 services. So, you no longer have to be labeled as the dumb student in order to say now can I have that extra help that I need?

It also requires that more moneys be driven out to the schools where they really need it. Thank you very much.

Mr. BECERRA. Thank you, Ms. Bustillos. It is obviously not only eloquent, but very forceful as well.

Let's move on to Ms. Chou. Thank you very much for coming as well. Obviously, this is another person who can tell us quite a bit from her own experiences about bilingual education and just the upbringing of children. So, please, we will turn now to Ms. Chou. Thank you for coming.

Ms. CHOU. Thank you for the opportunity. I am an Assistant Principal at Alhambra High School. I am in charge of Pupil Services. One of the biggest jobs on campus is to coordinate the counseling services of our students. I will speak from the site point of view, and I will not make a general statement for the district.

At Alhambra High School, we have 3,500 students. Out of 3,500 students, we have seven regular counselors. So, therefore, the counselor has a 500 to 1 load on a daily basis. With Chapter 1 money, we were fortunate to hire an additional counselor who now has 1,500 to 1 caseload because of the money situation. We are restricted to using Chapter 1 money for Chapter 1 services only. So, even though the Federal money that is coming in helps us, it does not help us enough with the restrictions.

I also would like to let you know that the Alhambra School District, as well as Alhambra High School has been very active in getting our bilingual program into the way we think it should be. The district has put in a lot of resources. In earlier days we were able to get some Title VII fundings. In those days, as you now, the Title VII funding was for three years only, and once the three years are up, it's up. So, the district had utilized whatever the money and the resources possible to continue with the services. We were really up to the capacity building language in the legislation. However, after what has happened to California, the State had not been able to provide the resources that we used to have, so we could not enjoy what we were able to do.

This last year we applied for another Title VII project. We were able to bring in after-school tutorial. As you know, with the Title

VII money that is coming in, we were only able to serve three high schools at around 60 students per high school out of the 3,500. So, we are looking again at a very small amount of money coming in, making a very small impact.

I wanted to talk about the successes, as a matter of fact, that we have had so far. We do have a very comprehensive high school program where the students can move from path to path. New immigrant students can begin with an ESL program that will give them intensive language development training, as well as giving them every opportunity possible to be in sheltered classes. We have offered a tremendous number of bilingual classes. We have bilingual classes in social studies, in sciences, in the upper level of mathematics, not your intermediate basic mathematics, but rather algebra and et cetera. We are moving again in that direction to make efforts to hire bilingual teachers. As you know, you cannot have a bilingual classroom without a bilingual teacher, even if you want to offer them calculus, bilingually, if you do not have a teacher that knows how to do it, either with language development specialists credential, or bilingual credential.

One of the other things I would like to emphasize more to a lot of the criticisms we have gotten so far with the bilingual education is that students do not want to learn English. I want you to know that every student I have encountered in my career of education of 20 years, beginning with the Washington, DC public schools, not one student had come through my office or worked in my classroom has said to me I refuse to learn English. Okay. They know that in order for them to survive in this country they have to. We have also to become passionate about where the students are coming from. They come from all walks of life. They come with all sorts of hardships that perhaps some of us do not have to endure, but they do. Schooling is probably their last consideration out of all what they had to do.

I remember working with a student who had 13 siblings. They were in a two-bedroom apartment. We were talking to the parents about having a nice, quiet place for them to study? Well, that was almost impossible, as you can tell. He tells me that they have one table. That everybody rotates on homework and dinner. So, the younger ones go first, and then come the older ones.

The other thing that you need to know—the students are very enthused about being here. They want to be here. They want to succeed. Not one of them had said to me that I am here because I wanted to receive welfare and that I wanted to drain the economy. I think everyone of them is here saying I want to get a job, I want to be a productive citizen of this country. By providing students with bilingual services, we have seen much more upbeat students on campus.

I can tell you Alhambra High School also has gone through a change in terms of demographics. For the first time, we have had more minority teachers, administrators on campus. Students feel good about coming up to us and telling us how much they enjoy the high school. Even if they do not speak the language, they know we do. So, we are able to communicate better. The students have also come and told us that they really appreciate our offering them the opportunity to learn in whichever mold and capacity they can.

They wanted to also let us know that they appreciate the fact that we appreciate their language and cultural values, as they appreciate ours.

Also, with bilingual education services, I have seen more and more parents coming to the schools. You know, we are talking about parent involvement. In the olden days, I still remember, as a teacher many moons ago, every time the Chinese New Year rolls around—and my job was to find Chinese parents to make egg rolls, you know, and we are seeing more and more deviation from that and really getting the parents to come in and work with the schools, and work with the students, making them understand the American school system, give them the encouragement that they need so that even though they have personal hardships, they will be able to survive.

As we all know, and as the parents become more and more comfortable with the school, with what is going on in the school, they are more likely to come in and help. I know that, in our high schools, every time we call for a meeting or what have you, we have quite a few parents showing up. In the past, we would look at a handful of parents out of 3,000 students. Now, we are looking at hundreds of parents. We have nice back-to-school turnouts. We have nice open house turnouts, because we have made that extra mile—we have gone that extra mile to get them involved by providing the bilingual personnel, by sending letters home in the primary language, by calling them on the phone, speaking the language that they understand and inviting them to school.

Finally, bilingual education has not only helped the immigrant students, but it also helped us, the Americans in this country. I want you to know that through even my own involvement in bilingual education, I have gained a lot of insights into what is happening. I have a little story to tell you. I had a student from Yugoslavia when I taught in Washington, DC. He was the one who actually predicted the turmoil in the country. He told me, you watch me, I am telling you this, we are going to have a war in my country. He knew all about it. He taught me about what is going on—the ethnic disparity in the country, even when he was only 15 years old. They understand a lot more than we do. They see a lot more than we do.

I also had a student who unfortunately was killed in Chile. You probably read about him in the paper. He was a photographer enthusiast. He went back to Chile to take pictures just for his own sake, and he was killed because they thought he was an agent. He also predicted that before he went back. So, I learned a lot by being associated with students coming from all different places and cultures.

Then, finally, I want you to know that I do keep in touch with my former students. Many of them have become bilingual teachers. I am very appreciative of that. Then, of course, the others have all become very productive citizens. As a matter of fact, unless people are not telling me anything else, as far as I can remember, the students that I have contact with, have really made it through bilingual education, and they have repeatedly come back to school and told their success stories.

So, in conclusion, I would like to say to you that I will continue to fight the good fight for bilingual education. I remain a very strong advocate for bilingual education, because I have seen what it has done for our students, for our parents, for the society, and even for myself. I also remain hopeful that we will not use bilingual education as the political scapegoat—that we will really concentrate on educating our students. Thank you very much.

Mr. BECERRA. Thank you, Ms. Chou. Thank you very much. Thank you for those words.

Let us now turn to Mr. Ron Prescott. It give me great pleasure to have Mr. Prescott here. We have had a chance to work with Mr. Prescott on many occasions. He is the individual who directs the legislation and government relations operations within the LA Unified School District. We thank him for being here and shedding some light on the subject of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Mr. Prescott.

Mr. PRESCOTT. Thank you, Congressman Becerra and Congresswoman Woolsey.

What I would like to speak to is the funding at the Federal level, and what we can do about that and what has happened to California over the last 12 years. I think that there are really three things that we are looking at. We are looking at the current law. There was a response to that this morning in terms of what needs to be fixed. Then we are looking at the President's proposal, which is several hundred pages. We got it last week, so we went through some things. Then we are listening to the Hispanic Caucus Proposal, which goes further than the President's proposal, I believe, in the right direction.

We are pleased to have the opportunity to respond to President Clinton's proposed Improving America's Schools Act of 1993. We are encouraged by many of the intended changes in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The improvement of the Nation's schools should not be an end in itself, but it should be stressed on the outcomes by requiring definitions of goals and standards and the means of determining that the progress and product of the educational systems are consistent with achieving those goals and standards. We must endeavor to provide a quality education for all of the students entrusted to us, whatever it takes.

Since the inception of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, the need for increased resources and improved methodologies has been recognized as essential to the successful teaching of economically-deprived children.

Formulas for distribution of categorical funds for this purpose have recognized the criterion of poverty, including the multiplying effect of high concentrations of children from low-income homes. Nevertheless, as Congressman Becerra indicated, only 10 percent of those funds allocated for compensatory education of the disadvantaged student has in the past focused on areas of high concentration from low-income families.

It is gratifying to see the support for those districts heavily impacted by poverty would be increased to 50 percent of the funds from Chapter 1 to be redesignated Title I, as in the original ESEA.

We also support the concept of concentrating Title I funds on schools with the highest incidence of poverty and providing schoolwide programs at a lower threshold of the percentages of children from low-income homes, eventually to be 50 percent of the current 75 percent. We concur that districts should provide Title I programs in all schools with at least 75 percent of their children coming from low-income homes.

We realize that the proposed formula change, as well as the use of most recent demographic data, would involve substantial shifts in the distribution of Title I funds, a concept that would help to address this problem, without relying solely on a hold harmless provision based on fiscal rather than educational need would be the inclusion of a factor based on incidence of home language other than English in the Title I formula. So, you would have poverty, and you would have demographic data from the census on languages spoken in the home other than English.

Although the concept has not been subjected to a fiscal analysis, it is likely that many of the districts that would be protected temporarily by the hold harmless provision would qualify for funds on an educationally justifiable basis of home language. Moreover, the inclusion of home language factor in the distribution formula will provide funds, as long as the educational needs persisted.

We were pleased to have an opportunity to discuss this concept with the Secretary of Education and Congressman Becerra in one of his community meetings. In addition, we proposed that the distribution from the States to the school districts be driven by the same factors as the distribution to the States.

We applaud the new testing concepts that would assure accountability for student achievement, and hope that they would be commensurate authority for school districts to control the resources intended for that purpose. We are concerned that unnecessary regulation could result in paperwork overload, diminishing the resources that could be applied to achieving the educational outcomes of the legislation.

We have some serious concerns about the redirection of the Chapter 2 funds which currently fund some very important curriculum support programs including libraries, educational technology, media services, literacy programs and staff development. Although we wholeheartedly agree with the need for increased and improved staff training and professional development, we urge that the valuable programs currently funded under Chapter 2 be assured continued support.

Since the dropout prevention demonstration programs have proven themselves, we believe that they should be supported as ongoing efforts. There seems to be no need for any further demonstration. We appreciate the increased flexibility that would be provided by the proposed reauthorization and the encouragement of systemic reform, which is essential and could enhance the numerous efforts being undertaken in Los Angeles today.

Finally, we share the goal of making high-poverty schools work. We look forward to the challenges, opportunities and expectations of the reauthorization of Elementary and Secondary Act proposed in H.R. 3130, Improving the American Schools.

Mr. BECERRA. Thank you, Mr. Prescott, for your testimony.

Let's now turn to some questions. As before, I will ask a few, and then turn to my colleague, and then perhaps we will have some wrap-up questions after the two of us have made our initial request for questions and answers.

Let me turn to the panel and ask those of you who have dealt with the issue of Chapter 1, most specifically—actually, let me address this one directly to Mr. Prescott. I do not believe a lot of people understand the whole issue of Chapter 1 and how politically driven the entire issue is. Perhaps you can give us a better idea and clarify for example what currently we see happening in terms of the dollar distribution, and what we might see, given the administration's formula or the Hispanic Caucus Bill's formula, or any other ideas you have on what should be done with Chapter 1 dollars.

Mr. PRESCOTT. Thank you, Congressman Becerra. That is really, to me, has been the struggle.

In order to get legislation through Congress, you have to be able to have a piece of legislation that appeals to a number of different areas in the country. So, what has happened with the Chapter 1 dollars that were originally intended for poor children, is that that money—those formulas have been I guess watered down to have political appeal to sections of the Nation that do not have large numbers of poor children. So, there are a number of school districts that are currently being funded under Chapter 1, Title I, that really do not meet the criteria that this panel this morning we have talked about.

Even in the current reauthorization proposal by the President, in order to get the proposal through Congress, its framers fund it necessary to provide an 85 percent hold harmless to school districts that would lose money under a redistribution formula. In other words, they could not lose any more than 15 percent of the money. That really ought to be in school districts where the demographics would determine it ought to be.

So, in a sense, we will have some school districts or some areas of the Nation that will be receiving funds, at least 85 percent of the funds they were receiving, when they do not have children that would otherwise be entitled to those funds.

What we are suggesting is, instead of having a mathematical concept of hold harmless—in other words, I am a school district that loses kids that would be eligible, so I get to keep 85 percent of the money—why don't we take another look at those school districts and see what in fact is going on in them.

New York, for example, or Boston would be districts that would lose money under the reauthorization, if there were not a hold harmless. If you were to look at New York, which has lost poverty, or Boston, which has lost poverty, you will find that they have gained people from other countries who have languages other than English spoken in the home.

So, what we are proposing is instead of looking at a pure hold harmless mathematical formula, that we look at an educational opportunity to use home language other than English as a factor in allocating Chapter 1 resources.

As Congressman Becerra indicated earlier, I imagine it would be politically very difficult to achieve, but that would have the effect of multiplying the California allocation by at least 200 percent.

Mr. BECERRA. Let me ask, further, if it is not yet clear, the Chapter 1 formula is driven by the census data, which gives us the count of poor children in a particular area. As a result of the new census count, 1990 census count, which shows the differences between 1990 and 1980—the 1980 census count, there are certain States such as California, Texas, other States that grew in the number of poor children in their State. There were other States which saw their percentage or number of poor children decrease or stay relatively the same. As a result, the Chapter 1 formula, which relies on the number of poor children, for the most part in calculating dollars to be distributed, is going to be driving more money towards these higher growth States, versus the lower growth States as they are being termed—high-growth and low-growth States.

The problem is further exacerbated by the fact that you look only at a county when you distribute the Chapter 1 dollar within a State. So, you have a county like Los Angeles, which has high concentrations of poverty in certain areas and lower, much lower concentrations of poverty, in fact, high wealth in other areas. Because the formula does not look at inter-county differences, but only at the county as a whole, the county gets the dollars and then distributes them in who knows which way to different local school agencies, school districts, some being wealthier than others and, as a result, many of the poor children, both in those wealthier school districts, and in the poor school districts do not get their fair share of their Chapter 1 dollars.

The Hispanic Caucus bill tries to target the money by school district, versus the county, because obviously a county of 9 million people has both wealth and poverty within it. Any comments from anyone on the panel with regard to if it is possible to try to target by school district versus county, do we have the capacity yet? If so, should we turn to that route?

Ms. FAY-BUSTILLOS. Well, I think that there is the capacity. The other thing that the Caucus bill does in line with this, is it also requires that the—or permits the Secretary of Education to contract with the Census Bureau, in order to have special updated estimates every two years prepared by the Census, which is very important. Because what happens, as you said, is that you have a 10-year gap between the next time that the formula is reconfigured for poverty. There have been huge changes across the country. So, what it does is it requires this supplement every two years in order to really make sure the money is being driven out to the districts that really need it.

According to Census Bureau testimony, as long as the school district is not under the size of 5,000, it actually can be done—the money actually can be reconfigured and sent out, even based on special updated estimates for those school districts. School districts below 5,000 there are some reliability issues.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Prescott, let me ask you a question with regard to LA Unified, or perhaps the State of California. Have you seen any estimates—or are you aware of any estimates that can tell us how many dollars the State of California or the Los Angeles

Unified School District has lost since 1980 because of the use of 1980 census data?

Mr. PRESCOTT. I have not seen that data. I can imagine that, if you look at the State—well, California is, for a lot of reasons, a donor State, and probably Chapter 1 allocation contributes to that. In other words, we send more money to Washington than we get back. I think that the number is probably astronomical, because we have not only not received, but we were entitled to, just based on the number of kids we had in 1980, because we never really got fully funded. In addition to that, because of the, as both of you well know, the politics of Washington, at least for the last several years, have mitigated against the Southwest and the West. I am thinking that that may be changing now, but I—I would say it is in excess of a billion dollars.

Mr. BECERRA. Thank you.

Ms. Chou, let me ask you a question now, turning to the issue of bilingual education. We will probably have a stronger teaching component within Title VII legislation, both the administration's bill has a tighter component for teacher training, and so does the Hispanic Caucus bill. How could we, in your opinion, encourage monolingual teachers to consider learning a second, perhaps even a third language in our school systems?

Ms. CHOU. My recommendation would be to start with the teacher training programs at the university level, and also strengthen the high school foreign language programs. It is very interesting at this point in time that our schools are still offering the traditional German, French, some Russian perhaps and Latin—that we are continually not moving into the direction of offering Pacific rim languages as well as strengthening our Spanish programs. I think, if we start at the high school level, or even the junior high school level—start getting the students interested in learning a foreign language, not just for graduating requirement, but actually looking at the future, that would help.

Our existing teachers today—I think what has happened also is that they have now come to the realization that they are working in a minority majority school nowadays, if you look around, especially in LA County area. There is not one school where there is not one limited English-proficient student. So, I think that also has helped.

The districts have to continually emphasize the importance of the additional professional-development type of programs. Some places have offered short-term training to bring them up to par. Alhambra School District does its own, but we are really using—draining our own additional resources to do that. So, I welcome the opportunity to have Title VII to continue providing that sort of training for teachers. What we really need to do is start encouraging the students at a very young age to consider teaching. We have so many very bright, young—I can tell you, 3,500 at my high school that I can see as potential teachers on a day to day basis. We are not doing a good job about pushing them into that direction.

Mr. BECERRA. Thank you.

Let me now yield to Congresswoman Woolsey for questions she may have for the panel.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Congressman, you have been asking most of my questions, and you did take up all of the time. This is your district, and I understand that.

I have a major concern about the Chapter 1 reformulation. That is that we do not overlook the poor pockets in the affluent districts, because there are poor kids everywhere. The politics of it is these more affluent districts that are actually the greater donors in this tax system. So, we have got to sell it. If we take everything away from their districts for their poor kids, then we are really going to lose it all the way around. So, we really have a job ahead of us in order to actually focus on the poorest of the poor, not take away from the poor to give to the poor, and make this work for all children and not because of politics, but it is going to take politics to drive it at this point. So, your help on that is going to be very important, because we have to look at the reality of the whole picture.

I have just one thing with Sally. What may coordinate the Education legislation that is coming? In the best of all worlds, would it make sense to have programs set up where the older children could tutor the younger ones after school on their bilingual challenges?

Ms. CHOU. Absolutely. Actually, in our district, we have a program where our high school students go to the elementary school during the sixth period as peer tutors. They do do that. Again, we are getting into transportation. We are only able to get the students who live in the neighborhood to do that. If they live further, it is harder. That definitely has to happen because, number one, our elementary schools feed into our high schools. This way, the kids have made already some connection with the high school. There is that encouragement also from the high school students to the elementary students to continue to finish high school, and tell them about what the bright future that is out there for them. So, it is definitely a good move.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Okay. Well, thank you.

Mr. BECERRA. Let me ask a couple more questions before we let these three members of the second panel go. I ask this of either of the three of you. How would we better involve parents in our Chapter 1 programs? How can we make sure that we do get their participation in the schools?

Ms. FAY-BUSTILLOS. I think actually Sally answered it. She actually spoke about a very successful parent involvement program, which is getting information out into the languages that they understand. It is in making sure that the atmosphere is more welcoming. One way to do that is to make sure that the people at the school site can communicate effectively with them. It is also to make sure that parents understand they have a responsibility. School is not just the responsibility of teachers and principals and aides, but it is the responsibility of parents as well, in order to make the whole system work. I am not sure that parents always are given the impression that the school feels that way. I am not sure that they always come to this educational system with that understanding. So, it is really stressing the partnership relationship and also making sure that you have staff that are linguistically able and also have the skills in order to reach out to parents.

Ms. CHOU. May I add?

Mr. BECERRA. Sure.

Ms. CHOU. Traditionally we call parents when we have a problem in our schools. I am also guilty of that because oftentimes we do not call them because the students have had wonderful achievement, or just made a little gain. We emphasize too much on the negatives. That is why sometimes when I call home I have to preface it right away. This is the assistant principal, but nothing has happened, but I just wanted to let you know and such, and this is being taken care of and what have you. So, we have to continue doing that.

I cannot emphasize more—I also came through the ranks of bilingual teacher, and we need to start really getting our bilingual teachers. We have to mentor them into administrators. I am proud to tell you we just hired another bilingual person for our career center, coordinator position, who came through the teacher ranks, and then the counselor, and what have you. We have to continue doing that—training our teacher aides to become teachers, and teachers to become administrators. Therefore, there is much more accessibility for parents to us than we have had before.

Mr. PRESCOTT. Something I have thought about a lot, and it is probably happening, I just do not know about it; but, it seems to me that, at least in Los Angeles, we have probably one of the largest adult education programs in the country. I am trying to find the interaction between that program and the kids' program. I know it happens when young people do not make it in the K–12 program, they end up in adult education programs sometimes, or sometimes later they come back and go to the adult education programs and career changes. What can we do at the Federal level to encourage an active interaction and participation between programs that serve adults and programs that serve children?

Mr. BECERRA. Good point. Very good point.

Let me thank the three panelists for coming today. I hope they are able to stay in the audience, because the panel has not quite ended. We still have three more people to go. I would thank them again for having come here today to testify. Thank you very much.

[Applause.]

Mr. BECERRA. We will have about a two-minute break while we get our next panelists up.

[Recess.]

Mr. BECERRA. If everyone would please take their seats, we are going to get started again. Folks, we have to have you take your seats and cease conversations or take them outside, because we still have several witnesses, and we would like to try to finish on time, if possible. I would ask that if you are going to have a conversation you take it outside.

We are going to proceed with the second panel, the fourth, fifth and sixth witnesses that we have. Let me just make a comment. We do have everyone's written testimony as part of the record, and we would appreciate it, because we are, again, running short on time, if you would keep your comments to within about three to five minutes, and we can—that way we have time for some questions. We do have, as I said before, your written testimony submitted before us.

Our first of three of the last three witnesses of the second panel will be Mr. Michael Genzuk. Mr. Genzuk is the Director at University of Southern California for the Latino Teacher Project. Mr. Genzuk is someone who has a great deal of knowledge and expertise in the area of bilingual education. Thank you for coming.

STATEMENTS OF MICHAEL GENZUK, DIRECTOR, UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA LATINO TEACHER PROJECT; ELVA FLORES, TEACHER, EASTMAN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL; AND MAGDALENA ARELLANES SOCEA, DIRECTOR, MIGRANT EDUCATION, REGION X, THE CALIFORNIA MIGRANT EDUCATION DIRECTORS' COUNCIL

Mr. GENZUK. Thank you for having me.

It is perfect timing on the agenda. I am really glad that I was spaced where I was, because we have heard so much testimony in regards to resources, methodology, assessment, all of which are very important components to educational programs. I think there will be no debate on that. All of them are useless without the part that I wish to speak to, and that deals with the teachers themselves.

Earlier, Xavier had mentioned that he had addressed the LA schools' bilingual program failing, according to the headlines in the LA Times, on September 3, 1993. I thought it was a very strong observation of his that, if you move past the sensationalism in the headlines and you investigate the narrative of the problem, it is the same one that is not only happening here in California, it is certainly not happening just in Los Angeles, but nationwide, and that is a chronic shortage of bilingual teachers. In my opinion, that is the single most important problem that we need to solve before we can implement any of these programmatic changes that we are talking about.

I thought, rather than going into a lot of different rhetoric, that I would start with what I call statement of the problem, which is the demographic story, which I think is just crying out for action.

Currently, there are many language groups that are served in government programs. I mean, the range of languages is just extraordinarily wide. You have heard Superintendent Thompson talk that there are over a hundred identified languages in LA Unified. It is truly the United Nations of school districts. In the State there is actually more than a hundred. I believe the last count I saw was 118 different languages being served in our public schools. Now, coupled with the number of limited English-proficient students, and I would like to use California as my example, simply because I think it is exemplary of the rest of the Nation. We now have over 1 million identified limited English-proficient students in our K–12 programs.

Now, on the surface, that number may seem rather large and staggering, but when you really put it in proportion and you look at what demographers and sociologists tell us, is that that number is really closer to two million if you count the kids that have fallen through the cracks, if you look at how there were improper methods of collecting that data information. Just for the sake of today's presentation, let's stick with that million, which is a phenomenal number of students. Soon California will have over half of its popu-

lation being Latino. Over half of its population by the year 2000 is estimated to be LEP. California will soon have half of the Nation's limited English-proficient students by the year 2000. Not only 64 percent of Los Angeles Unified is limited English-proficient, but 64 percent is Latino as well.

While the student population that I demonstrated is large and increasing, the supply of teachers qualified to serve these students is, as best, modest. I think that it is best exemplified if we take a look just at California's needs for the education of these language-minority students. California currently needs, according to the State Department of Education, over 18,000, close to 19,000 bilingual teachers to serve these one million identified limited English-proficient students. It also needs over 17,000 English language development teachers. So, we are talking about in excess of 35,000 certificated teachers just in the State of California, to address the needs of language minority students that are not in those classrooms currently.

Now, to really present the problem I think most succinctly, we have to look at the teachers that are in preparation in the State of California. Currently, we have 28,000 teachers in preparation K–12 teachers. Of those 28,000 teachers in preparation, anywhere from sophomores through graduate school in California, only 2 percent, less than 600 are preparing to meet the needs of language minority students. Now, clearly, 2 percent is not a solution to address the needs of these well over one million students.

So, since we have relatively few currently-employed teachers that are minority or bilingual, and since the teachers in preparation certainly are not addressing that, what we need to do is we need to focus on where do we find the future teachers to address the needs of this massive population in the State of California.

A promising approach is to help bilingual teacher assistants, those bilingual paraprofessionals, or what we like to refer to in the literature as paraeducators, to enter the university to complete programs of teacher education and to get their degrees. Now, in doing this, I think we need to look at this population and recognize that not only is it a population that is sitting and waiting for this, but it is a population that may be better prepared to take on the role of teacher than any population prior in the history of education.

As native speakers of the students' languages, paraeducators, in many cases, have had the personal experience of acquiring English as a second language, and they are sensitive to differing cultural values and attitudes.

Another reason for considering and encouraging these teacher assistants to become teachers is the large number of such individuals currently employed in schools. If you will refer to the narrative that I submitted to you, you will see on page 5 of the narrative that currently in California, actually, this is not current, this is already a couple of years old, because they do not keep annual accounts of this, we have over 26,000 paraeducators in the State of California that are providing primary language instruction in our bilingual classrooms. Now, if you take that number, it is kind of an interesting coincidence that that would easily solve the current shortage of bilingual teachers in the State, if we were to employ them and pro-

vide this career pathway for them to become the bilingual educators that we so desperately need.

Survey research that we have conducted at USC with a sampling of over 17,000 paraprofessionals indicates that over 50 percent or more of these paraeducators have aspirations to become teachers, but that there are major barriers that fall in the way and that do not allow them to become the teachers that we so desperately need.

Now, what I would like to do because I understand time is short—let me just tell you real generically, they fall basically into four categories those barriers, and then I will leave it to question and answer, if you want to know more details on this.

The number one impediment for paraprofessionals becoming teachers is financial. Without a doubt, because they come from a position that is not paid and paying well, in most cases paraeducators in the United States are female. Over 75 percent of the paraeducators in this country are female, and they come from backgrounds where there is not a great deal of interest in the family structure or in the communities to encourage the professionalism of this particular population.

Now, besides the financial impediments that are there, there is tremendous social impediments for this population, and a lot of it has to do with cultural factors and financial, socioeconomic strata factors. The third is academic problems. This population, in many instances, have been away from the educational environment for a sufficient amount of time to where they have to regain their tools to be successful in the educational environment. And the fourth and interestingly enough, one of the biggest impediments is the school environment where they work, where they have—on the surface are encouraged by school administrators and teachers to become real teachers, when the time comes for them to leave and go to the university, there are subliminal messages being given, do not leave school, we need you desperately, because you are the linguistic and the cultural link with our community. So, there are a number of barriers that they need to overcome that seem to stand in the way quite substantially.

Now, what we are recommending is that basically there is a vision—we now know what works. We know how to overcome the needs of this particular population to become the teachers, and thanks to the generosity of the Ford Foundation, there are seven programs nationwide that have received seed money to set up programs to get minorities into teaching. The one at USC focuses specifically on bilingual Latinos.

In less than two years' time, we have had tremendous success that far exceeded our expectations. We truly believe that we know a better way of not only preparing minorities or bilingual teachers, but, in reality, all teachers, because it involves a longer introduction, a longer, for lack of a better term, I would say apprenticeship time to become quality successful teachers.

Out of consideration to time, I would just like to make a few recommendations, and then I will turn it over to the panel. I would like to recommend expansion of Part C of Public Law 1297, in other word, Title VII, bilingual education. In Part C they are talking about programs for training and technical assistance for teachers. I just feel dramatically that if we are going to implement ev-

erything else that we have talked about, then we have to make sure the teachers are in place to implement these quality programs that we are talking about. So, I highly recommend to expand the funding for educational, personnel training programs. Currently, it is at about the $15 million level. I just think that is totally inadequate.

The Training, Development and Improvement Program, which is a mere $800,000 is allotted to that. We are talking about the retraining of existing teachers and expansion of programs.

I think the third part that I want to recommend—my final one is, in terms of looking at other resources besides Chapter 1 and Title VII, we have talked a lot about the coordinated services in health care and other areas. I think we need to do that in terms of teacher preparation as well. I think if we look, for example, at Secretary Cisneros in HUD, or if we look at a lot of the other human development projects that President Clinton has suggested, there is a lot of money there that could be very properly spent in preparing the future teachers, and empowering our particular communities.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Genzuk follows:]

S. MICHAEL GENZUK
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

INTRODUCTION

Despite recent attempts by State Departments of Education and Local Education Agencies we have failed to increase the supply of bilingual teachers needed to meet the instructional needs of the rapidly growing numbers of limited-English-proficient (LEP) students (Olsen and Chen, 1988). This testimony proposes that bilingual para-educators, teacher assistants currently working in classrooms with LEP students, are a promising source of future bilingual teachers. It will also discuss possible barriers to the process of preparing this potential work force to take its place among the ranks of the nation's teachers. The importance of this information is rooted in the need of the public education systems throughout the country to adequately serve a more diverse student population.

BACKGROUND

Estimation of Limited English Proficient Student Population

Estimates of the number of students in the United States in need of bilingual instruction range between 3.5 and 6.4 million students of school age (Macías, 1993; Olsen, 1991). Consider California, a state that continues to lead the nation in identifying LEP students. The results of the 1992 language census, conducted by school districts during the Spring of 1992, identified 1,078,705 LEP students in California public schools, an increase of 9.4% over the 986,462 reported in 1991. The number of LEP students increased from 14.0 to 21.1 percent of the total enrollment in California public schools between 1987 and 1992. In Los Angeles County alone there are 433,731 limited English-proficient (LEP) students. The state's rate of growth in the number of LEP students has averaged 18% since 1985 with a total of 77% of all identified LEP students speaking Spanish (California Dept. of Education, 1991, 1992). The public school system must transform itself in order to more adequately serve this diverse student population. Students must be presented with understandable, relevant instruction in order to be successful in the school environment (Genzuk and Hentschke, 1992).

Demand for and Supply of Bilingual Teachers

While the student LEP population is large and increasing, the supply of teachers qualified to serve these students is modest. Macias (1989) estimated that in 1980 there were about 56,000 teachers with minimal or basic bilingual preparation nationally, but there was a need of from 68,000 to about 120,000. These numbers are more than a decade old, however. Since then, there has been a minority student population explosion in the nation's schools. The California Department of Education estimated that in 1992, there were about 9,000 qualified bilingual teachers, but more than 28,000 were needed, a gap of about 20,000. This discrepancy between total numbers of minority students and teachers represents a significant hurdle.

Minority teachers are clearly one of the most appropriate teaching forces for this population. The bases for this assumption are:

1) Minority teachers who speak the child's first language can deliver subject matter instruction and provide literacy development in that language. The advantages of these kinds of contributions have theoretical justifications: subject-matter knowledge gained through the first language makes second language input more comprehensible and thus leads to second language competence, and literacy development in the first language transfers to the second language. In addition, there is widespread empirical support that bilingual education providing these features is very effective (Cummins, 1989; Krashen & Biber, 1988).

2) Cultural and linguistic identification between students and teacher is desirable as teachers provide positive role models that both enhance the self-esteem of their students and provide greater contextual and interaction opportunities (Walker, 1987). According to Cummins (1989), role definitions are central to the "empowerment of language minority students".

3) The concept of providing "supportive environments for children (Delgado-Gaitan, 1987, p. 131)"... in which the validity and integrity of the (home) culture of the student can be confirmed as an extension of the knowledge base of the teacher is educationally enhancing.

Relatively few currently employed teachers are minority, however. Table 1 shows that minority students represented over 54% of the total school population, but minority teachers made up only 18% of the teaching force. While 34% of the students were Latino, only 7.5% of the teachers were, the smallest proportional representation of any ethnic group (California Department of Education, 1992).

TABLE 1
California K-12 Student Enrollment and Teacher Labor Force : 1990-91

	No. Students	% Total	No. Teachers	% Total
Latino	1,702,363	34.4	16,501	7.5
Asian	524,326	10.5	9,157	4.1
African American	426,356	8.6	12,336	5.6
Native American	38,112	0.8	1,610	0.7
White	2,259,317	45.6	179,183	81.9
Total	4,950,474	99.9	218,787	99.8

This under representation of Latino teachers sends numerous negative messages to students and the general population. Most importantly, more generations of students will be lost if we are unable to provide teachers who understand these students and are sensitive to their unique needs.

Bilingual Para-Educators as a Source of Bilingual Teachers

The number of candidates entering teacher training programs in universities and colleges and in local school settings presently does not match the population growth of LEP students (California Dept. of Education, 1992). We must look in other directions.

A promising approach is to help bilingual teaching assistants become credentialed teachers. In many ways, para-educators have the potential to become the ideal teachers of LEP students. As native speakers of the students' languages, para-educators, in many cases, have the personal experience of acquiring English as a second language, and they are sensitive to differing cultural values and attitudes. Another reason for considering encouraging teaching assistants to become teachers is the large number of such individuals currently employed in schools. Table 2 depicts the number of para-educators providing primary language instruction to LEP students in California

(California Dept. of Education, 1992). It is very interesting to note that the total number of para-educators involved in primary language instruction in California (26,000) would provide the remedy to the nearly 19,000 bilingual teachers currently needed.

TABLE 2
Number of Para-Educators Providing Primary Language Instruction to LEP Students in California

Language	LEP Students (K-12)	Para-Educators
Spanish	828,036	22,989
Vietnamese	45,155	685
Cantonese	22,262	523
Cambodian	20,752	447
Pilipino	19,345	199
Korean	16,078	148
All others	127,077	1,437
Total	**1,078,705**	**26,428**

The large number of para-educators provides a significant source of future bilingual teachers. It is estimated that about 25 percent of para-educators might try to complete college and become credentialed teachers during the next five years. About 6,000 more bilingual teachers would then be available (California Dept. of Education, 1991). Additional survey research estimates that 50% or more of the para-educator population have aspirations of becoming teachers (Lavadenz, forthcoming).

If we can clear obstacles to additional education, those aspiring to become teachers will have a better chance of succeeding and perhaps more para-educators will consider becoming credentialed teachers.

BARRIERS TO PARA-EDUCATOR TEACHER PRODUCTION

Based on a review of the literature, the following are hypothesized obstacles related to the potential credentialing of para-educators as teachers. It is essential that these obstacles be identified in order to activate this resource as a potential remedy to the current bilingual teacher shortage. Many minority students do not attend college or, if they do attend, encounter problems due to socioeconomic, attitudinal, and motivational

factors, as well as personal needs and backgrounds. Following are four primary obstacles that need to be overcome to provide a pathway for para-educators to teacher certification.

1. **Financial**: Para-educators are not well paid. A report prepared by the National Paraprofessional/School related Personnel Committee of the American Federation of Teachers found that the mean wage rate for teacher assistants was only slightly higher than cafeteria workers and less than the average wage paid to bus drivers and custodians (Pickett, 1989). Because of their financial situation, para-educators clearly need help to continue their education.

Aid, however, is not easily available. There has been a shift from grants for minority students to loan programs (Garcia and Baptiste, 1991). It is understandable that those already struggling will be hesitant to take on more indebtedness. In addition, higher education institutions, from community colleges to four year colleges and institutions have made notably few efforts to secure funding in order to increase their minority enrollment (Contreras and Engelhardt, 1991).

2. **Social**: The vast majority of para-educators are women who also bear family responsibilities and who generally represent the minority groups prevalent in their communities. Lack of support and obligations imposed by spouses, parents and children, in addition to other social pressures encountered by para-educators, are obstructive. Harper (1992), considers the case of a para-educator from San José, California. Alicia, enrolled in a career ladder program, describes her experience:

> "I was having trouble with my family. They were upset because I was not at home to cook and to do the things I used to do. I was always either going to school or studying for a test. After Lucia and Carol and I talked, I realized that they had the same problem. Just knowing that made me feel better- less guilt- you know what I mean?"

This statement is indicative of the problems many para-educators encounter. Houston and Calderón (1991) point out that "Minorities, particularly first generation immigrants, often have no role models to emulate. Many are the first persons from their family to attend college, and emotional support and encouragement comes only from college peers."

We should point out, however, that while the impact of family has been articulated repeatedly to us by participants in career development programs as they

discuss their reasons for success, a review of the literature shows that there has been limited documented evidence other than anecdotal records in affirming this hypothesis.

3. **Academic:** Though there is little direct evidence, there is reason to hypothesize that para-educators attempting to become teachers will run into more academic problems than most other teacher education candidates. Research has documented, for example, that Latino candidates have a lower than average pass rate on admissions tests for teacher education (Gillis, 1991), on teacher competency tests (Valencia and Aburto, 1991), and on teacher certification exams (Gillis, 1991). Gillis, for example, presents typical data, based on 49,000 students taking an examination for admission to teacher education programs in Texas (Table 3).

Table 3
Number Passing all Parts of Education Admissions Exam from Spring 1984 to Summer 1987 by Ethnicity

ETHNICITY	No. Taking	No. Passing	% Passing	% of Those Passing
Black	2,342	758	32.4	2.1
Hispanic	6,365	2,973	46.7	8.1
White	39,814	32,086	80.6	88.1
Other	1,079	617	57.2	1.7
Total	49,600	36,434	73.5	100.0

The typical reaction to such a situation is to provide counseling and "study skills" classes. There is evidence that counseling for Latino teacher education students is inadequate. Wink and Flores (1992) have found that 58% of Latino teacher respondents report insufficient individualized faculty counseling in their college years; only 29% received help in the form of counseling, and only 11% received help in the form of mentoring. There is also evidence suggesting that supplementary "adjunct" classes, supplements to regular history, mathematics and composition classes emphasizing study skills can help (Caswell, 1991).

There are, however, problems with these traditional approaches. First, study skills classes may simply be providing students with strategies of succeeding in traditional "study and memorize" classes, methods that may be in conflict with the

philosophy of education students are learning in their educational theory and practice courses.

Second, traditional approaches may not be attacking the real problem. Like other working class students, para-educators, we propose, do not lack "intelligence," but may need fuller development of what Cummins (1991) terms academic language.

A powerful means of developing this kind of language is reading, free reading in both the first and second language (Krashen, 1993). Free reading in either language will supply some of the knowledge base as well as the advanced literacy competence that will help contribute to university success in a way that is consistent with the philosophy of education that underlies our bilingual teacher education programs. Course work in popular literature as well as individualized reading may be very helpful, especially when they occur early in the para-educator's academic career, so they can provide the knowledge and literacy base that will lead to success in academic life. Needless to say, the advanced competence gained through reading in two languages will also improve the para-educators' instructional delivery capabilities.

4. **School Site Personnel and School District Bureaucracy:** Surveyed teaching assistants have suggested that school site administrators and classroom teachers have indicated their willingness to support them in their pursuit of a teaching career. However, when the time comes for teaching assistants to leave to attend class, this support may dissipate. Classroom teachers and school site administrators recognize that the bilingual teaching assistant, in many instances, is the only link, both linguistically and culturally, with the parents and community as well as the classroom. Therefore, as well intentioned as they may be, they deliver conflicting messages by encouraging these participants to stay at school to continue providing needed services (Genzuk and Hentschke, 1992).

Other examples of the psycho-social and financial barriers faced by para-educators exist within the school district bureaucracy and is revealed in their treatment as "second-class citizens" and "exploitation" at their school sites (Barron, 1980; Dalgety, 1990). Low salaries, lack of health benefits, unstable job security and lack of career advancement opportunities have created this feeling of exploitation, which leads to low self-esteem and a lack of confidence to pursue higher education and a teaching career. The impact of these work site issues are further compounded when experienced with the numerous other obstacles encountered by para-educators.

CONCLUSION

Critical to and essential for effective recruitment and retention of para-educators into the teaching force is a program designed for this specific population. They have not, will not and, often, can not take the "traditional" programs that were designed for the typical younger college bound student (Hollis & Houston, 1991). If the aforementioned themes are indeed the obstacles to para-educators becoming teachers, and the research is scant, then the following issues need to be addressed:

1) Financial: grants, scholarships, financial aide, wages and benefits.
2) Social: Provision of special programs and events for sensitizing the para-educator's entire support group to academic and social pressures that they may be encountering. This would include family, university faculty, school site personnel and community.
3) Academic: The role of counseling, adjunct courses, and other means of increasing academic language proficiency.
4) School Site: improved working conditions (salary, benefits, job security, etc.). Nurturing, supportive environment while following career pathway into teaching.

Para-educators are a potential source of credentialed teachers. If the above mentioned obstacles are overcome, especially those related to salaries and to underwriting college and training fees, a large number of para-educators would be within reach to try to complete college and become credentialed teachers.

Para-educators have the capacity to become the ideal teachers of LEP students. As native speakers of the students' languages, para-educators, in many cases, have the personal experience of acquiring English as a second language themselves, and they are sensitive to differing cultural values and attitudes. They bring with them a great deal of classroom experience and a sense of how children learn. They will probably stay in the profession where their dedication to children and to learning has been demonstrated.

REFERENCES

Barron, J. (1980). Issues in Bilingual education Affecting Performance Needs of Teacher Aides with Implications for Teacher Training Programs. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Southern California. Los Angeles, CA.

California Department of Education. (1991). Remedying the Shortage of Teachers for Limited-English-Proficient Students: Report to the Superintendent from the Task Force on Selected LEP Issues. Sacramento, CA.

California Department of Education. (1992). R-30LC, Annual Language Census.

Caswell, R.M. (1991). Adjunct Class Sessions: Assisting Underprepared Students To Achieve Academic Success. Teacher Education and Practice: The Journal of the Texas Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. San Marcos, TX.

Contreras, G. & Engelhart, J.M. (1991). Attracting and Recruiting an Ethnically Diverse Teaching Force. Teacher Education and Practice: The Journal of the Texas Association of Colleges for teacher Education, pgs. 39-43. San Marcos, TX.

Cummins, J. (1991). Interdependence of first-and second-language proficiency in bilingual children. In E. Bialystok (Ed.): Language Processing in Bilingual Children. Cambridge University Press, pp. 70-89. Cambridge, England.

Cummins, J. (1989). Empowering Minority Students. California Association for Bilingual Education. Sacramento, CA.

Cummins, J. (1982). The Role of Primary Language development in Promoting Educational Success for language Minority Students. In: Schooling and Language Minority Students: A Theoretical Framework. California State Department of Education, Office of Bilingual Education. Sacramento, CA.

Dalgety, M. (1990). Teacher Assistants: The History of a Community Exploited. Los Angeles City and County School Employees Union, Local 99. Los Angeles, CA.

Delgado-Gaitan, C. (1987). Parent Perceptions of School: Supportive Environment for Children. In H. Trueba (Ed.), Success or Failure? Learning and the Language Minority Student. Newbury House Publishers. Cambridge, MA.

Garcia, R. & Baptiste, H.P. (1991). Minority Recruitment and Retention in Teacher Education. The Journal of the Texas Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, pgs. 13-21. San Marcos, TX.

Genzuk, S.M. & Hentschke, G.C. (1992). Career Pathways for Para-Educators: The Ford Foundation Latino Teacher Project Progress Report. University of Southern California School of Education, Los Angeles, CA.

Gillis, M.K. (1991). Impact of Testing on Minorities Entering Teaching. Teacher Education and Practice: The Journal of the Texas Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, pgs. 23-27. San Marcos, TX.

Harper, V. (1992). Educational Paraprofessionals: A Path to Increased Diversity in Teaching. A paper presented to the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, San Antonio, TX.

Hollis, L.Y. & Houston, R.W. (1991). Recruiting Mature Adults as Teachers. Teacher Education and Practice: The Journal of the Texas Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, pgs. 29-36. San Marcos, TX.

Houston, R.W. & Calderón, M. , (1991). Preparing an Ethnically Diverse teaching Force. Teacher Education and Practice: The Journal of the Texas Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, pgs. 43-49. San Marcos, TX.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Krashen, S. (1993). The Power of Reading: Insights from the Research. Libraries Unlimited, Inc. Englewood, Colorado.

Krashen, S. & Biber, D. (1988). On Course: Bilingual Education's Success Story in California. California Association for Bilingual Education. Sacramento, CA.

Lavadenz, M. (forthcoming). The Role of Paraprofessionals in the Instruction of Limited English Proficient Students. University of Southern California. Los Angeles, CA. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Macias, R.F. (1993). Language and Ethnic Classification of Language Minorities: Chicano and Latino Students in the 1990's. Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Science. Newbury Park, CA.

Macias, R.F. (1989). Bilingual Teacher Supply and Demand in the United States. University of Southern California Center for Multilingual, Multicultural Research and the Tomás Rivera Center, Los Angeles, CA.

Olsen, L. & Chen, M. T. (1988). Crossing The School House Border: Immigrant Students and California Public Schools. California Tomorrow, San Francisco, CA.

Olsen, R.E. (1991). How many are there? TESOL Field Services, Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Inc., Alexandria, VA.

Pickett, A.L. (1989). Restructuring the Schools: The Role of Paraprofessionals. Center for Policy Research, National Governor's Association.

Valencia R.R., & Aburto, S. (1991) Competency Testing and Latino Student Access to the Teaching Profession: An Overview of Issues. Assessment and Access: Hispanics in Higher Education. State University of New York Press, New York, NY.

Walker, C. (1987). Hispanic Achievement: Old Views and New Perspectives. In H. Trueba (Ed.), Success or Failure? Learning and the Language Minority Student. Newbury House Publishers. Cambridge, MA.

Wink, J. and Flores, J.M. (1992). Induction Programs for Bilingual Teachers: Addressing the Needs of Teachers in Language Minority Education. Journal of the Association of Mexican American Educators, Inc. Sacramento, CA.

Mr. BECERRA. Thank you, Mr. Genzuk.

[Applause.]

Mr. BECERRA. Let's move on. Of course, during this whole discussion, we wanted to make sure we had the perspective of someone who is currently teaching, not someone who has been a teacher. We are very thankful that Ms. Elva Flores agreed to be here with us. Ms. Flores is a teacher at Eastman Elementary School. Thank you for coming.

Ms. FLORES. Thanks for having me.

Buenos dias, y gracias a todos padres presentes. Es muy importante su presencia a retierre a mas career de es los.

My name is Elva Flores. I am going to stick to my statement because I know we are short on time.

Schools impact future opportunity more directly than any other institution. Educational success or failure indicates, to a large degree, the students' options for economic upward mobility. As such, the role of bilingual education has become increasingly vital in affording opportunity and equal access to those students who have yet to acquire English.

As the vehicle for affording equal opportunity and equal access, bilingual education is eminently feasible. It is pragmatic, effective and, above all, desperately needed. We have a burgeoning immigrant population. This fact alone compels us to do all we can to meet the needs of those children.

In my experience as a bilingual teacher, I have seen many changes occur within the classroom in order to more effectively meet the needs of language minority children. I use the term minority advisedly because, as you have heard before from the other panelists, minority is no longer the fact. Majority is more like it.

I have over 15 years of teaching experience and so I have had the benefit of implementing research-based methodology and curriculum designs. More importantly, I truly believe my students have benefited from bilingual education. How do I know? Because they come back and tell me so. Sometimes they do not actually come back to see me, but I will run into them at their places of employment, like Gloria Murillo at the bank, or Alberto Maruffo, who is the manager now at Pep Boys, and more importantly and touchingly for me, one of my former students is now my colleague as well, Juana Gallegos is now a teacher where I work as well.

There are others that I know of as well. Ilda Villalobos is now a college student. She wants to be a child psychologist, bilingual, of course. Angel Saleido recently sent me a postcard from Adams State College in Colorado where he is now a scholarship student. What do they all have in common? They did not speak English when they started school, and they all were taught bilingually.

I do not pretend that this is a scientific statistical example; but it is valid and concrete evidence to me that these young people have been positively impacted by their time at a school that had a bilingual program. They are able to successfully compete in the job market at college, they maintain their ability to speak Spanish, and they have acquired a level of English that will provide a viable future for them in the job market. These are the kind of people we want in our society. These are the kind of people we will need to have in a multicultural, multilingual society that works. These are

the kind of people we will have, as a result of successful bilingual programs.

The work I and other teachers do and the way in which it is done is a direct outcome of a collaborative effort. The collaborative effort has been spearheaded by a community of researchers, university instructors, district instructional leaders, lawmakers, and countless other visionaries who saw a growing need in the student population that had to be met in a careful, cogent and cohesive manner.

I have reaped the benefit of this effort, in that I think I am a more effective teacher because of it. I lament that all of this knowledge was not mine when I began teaching. I am keenly cognizant of the advantages that a new bilingual teacher, in starting his or her career will have. More significantly, I am aware of the advantages that will accrue to the students and ultimately to our society as a result of this knowledge and follow-up.

If the means of propagating effective bilingual education are not promoted and effectively supported, the consequences to our society will be long-term, and I think they will be intensely negative. We cannot afford that kind of future. As it is, our present is rife with examples of people who are marginalized. Many of them live a degraded existence because of a lack of basic literacy and other fundamental skills. Obviously, there can be and there are diverse reasons for why people are not able to succeed. Let's be sure that the lack of a good education is eliminated as one of those reasons.

It is my profound hope that I will not be taken by you today as some sort of Mexican Cassandra, one who foretells of a grave dark happening in the future, only to be dismissed and then ultimately, sadly, proven correct. I would rather be perceived by you as a member of the teaching community, a professional who has had ample opportunities and experience seeing the results of investing time and training in our teachers, support for bilingual programs, and the resultant meaningful education for our students.

My objective today will have been to apprise you of my personal belief as to the efficacy of bilingual education and its function as a vehicle for reaching a target population, and to sustain an immutable fact—that the students can succeed when the opportunity exists, when equal access exists, and when the curriculum is addressed to their specific needs.

I sincerely thank you for your time.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Flores follows:]

STATEMENT OF ELVA FLORES, TEACHER, EASTMAN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Schools impact future opportunity more directly than any other institution. Educational success or failure indicates, to a large degree, the students' options for economic upward mobility. As such, the role of bilingual education has become increasingly vital in affording opportunity and equal access to those students who have yet to acquire English.

As the vehicle for affording equal opportunity and equal access, bilingual education is eminently feasible. It is pragmatic, effective and, above all, desperately needed. We have a burgeoning immigrant population, and this fact alone compels us to do all we can to meet the needs of the students.

In my experience as a bilingual teacher, I have seen many changes occur within the classroom in order to more effectively meet the needs of language-minority children. I use the term minority despite the fact that the minority in Los Angeles is now the majority. I have over 15 years of teaching experience and so have had the benefit of implementing research-based methodology and curriculum designs. More

importantly, I truly believe my students have benefited from bilingual education. How do I know? Because they come back and tell me so.

Sometimes they don't actually come back to see me, but I'll run into them at the place of employment, like Gloria Murillo at the bank, or Alberto Maruffo at Pep Boys, where he is the manager, and of course at the school where I teach where Juana Gallegos, my former student is now a teacher and my colleague.

There are others I know of as well. Ilda Villalobos is now a college student. She wants to be a child psychologist (a bilingual one of course), and Angel Saleido recently sent me a postcard from Adams State College in Colorado, where he's a scholarship student. What do they all have in common? They didn't speak English when they started school, and they were taught bilingually.

I don't pretend that this is a scientific statistical sample, but it is valid and concrete evidence to me that these young people have been positively impacted by their time at a school that had a bilingual program. They are able to successfully compete in the job market and in college. They have maintained their ability to speak Spanish, and they have acquired a level of English that will provide a viable future in the job market. These are the kind of people we *want* in our society. These are the kind of people we will *need* to have in a multicultural, multilingual society that works. These are the kind of people we *will have*, as a result of successful bilingual programs.

The work I and other teachers do and the way in which it is done is a direct outcome of a collaborative effort. The collaborative effort has been spearheaded by a community of researchers, university instructors, district instructional leaders, lawmakers, and countless other visionaries who saw a growing need in the student population that had to be met in a careful, cogent and coherent manner. I have reaped the benefit of this effort, in that I think I'm a more effective teacher because of it. I lament that all this knowledge wasn't mine when I began teaching, but I'm keenly cognizant of the advantages that a new bilingual teacher has in starting his or her career. More significantly, I'm aware of the advantages that will accrue to the students and ultimately to our society, as a result of this knowledge and follow-up.

If the means of propagating effective bilingual education are not promoted and effectively supported, the consequences to our society will be long-term, and I think they will be intensely negative. We can't afford that kind of future. As it is, our present is rife with examples of people who are marginalized. Many of them live a degraded existence because of a lack of basic literacy and other fundamental skills. Obviously, there can be and there are diverse reasons for why people aren't able to succeed, let's be sure that the lack of a good education is eliminated as one of those reasons.

It is my profound hope that I will not be taken by you today as some sort of Mexican Cassandra—one who foretells of grave and dark happenings in the future, only to be dismissed and then ultimately, sadly, proven correct. I would rather be perceived by you as a member of the teaching community, a professional who has had ample opportunities and experience seeing the results of investing time and training in our teachers, support for bilingual programs, and the resultant meaningful education for our students.

My objective today will have been to apprise you of my personal belief as to the efficacy of bilingual education and its function as a vehicle for reaching a target population, and the sustained and immutable fact that the students can succeed when the opportunity exists, when equal access exists, and when the curriculum is addressed to their specific needs.

I sincerely thank you for your time and attention you have given me.

Mr. BECERRA. Thank you, Ms. Flores. Thank you very much.

Let's move on now and talk about a program that oftentimes is neglected in our discussions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and that is migrant education. Oftentimes we forget that there are children who have a very difficult time being educated, not only because there is inadequate support at the schools, but oftentimes because they have to travel from school to school and never really have a chance to really lay their foundation. So, today, we have with us Magdalena Socea, who is the Director of Migrant Education in Region 10. Magdalena, thank you very much for coming and please provide us with some insight.

Ms. SOCEA. Thank you. Premaramente quiere necessita tambien. Bien venidos a los padres que estan aqui en presentatos in esta hunta.

Good morning, or is it good afternoon? I am not sure. Congressman Becerra, and Congresswoman Woolsey, thank you for the opportunity to testify on behalf of migrant education students. Yes, I am the Director of the Migrant Education Program here in Region 10, serving Los Angeles County. I am here today representing the California Migrant Education Directors Council.

The California Migrant Education Directors Council represents 18 regional directors that are charged with administering the migrant education program in California. Fourteen of these directors are responsible for programs with budgets and student populations larger than statewide programs in 30 other States. The migrant students in this region number over 20,000. Twenty-eight school districts participate in the program, the largest of which is Los Angeles Unified, with close to 11,000 of the region's students.

You have a copy of the written recommendations from our counsel. My oral testimony today will focus on the concept of clustering. As proposed by Congressman Kildee and the United States Department of Education, and the legislation recently introduced by Congressmen Ford and Goodling, which is H.R. 2769. As regional directors, whose major responsibility is the education of migrant children, we are very concerned and opposed to the concept of clustering. I would like to highlight six of those concerns.

First of all, while there may be certain programmatic and educational rationales for clustering Federal categorical program funds, the bottomline is that migrant students will be lost in the shuffle and excluded from services that are financed, the resources that are meant to improve their education.

In 1979, the findings of a statewide committee that was charged with completing a comprehensive study on the governance, management and operation of the California Migrant Education Program led to the development of the current regional structure. Briefly, they found that the regional structure not only ensures that migrant funds follow migrant students, but also allows for more comprehensive educational and also additional support type services to meet the special needs of migrant students.

For example, dental screening in our Region 10 last year, revealed that about 21 percent of our migrant students had urgently needed dental care. These are infections of gums and teeth. Migrant deduction regional funds paid for urgent remediation for over 700 of these migrant students, covering fees ranging from an average of $60 to $1,600. These support services are not offered under Chapter 1 currently. With the proposed legislation, it looks like it might be.

A second concern regarding the clustering concept includes the current allocation of categorical funds within the school district. I wanted to take a moment here to address two issues that are in the Equal Access to Education Act of 1993, introduced by you, Congressman Becerra, and Congressman Serrano, that affect migrant education programs.

First of all, I want to support and applaud the position being taken that limited English proficiency be included as a factor in the

criteria for receiving Chapter 1 funds. Presently, Chapter 1 funds require students to be tested annually on a standardized test, usually in English, in order to qualify for services. These tests are usually given in the spring or fall of the year, which often eliminates migrant students from the test because of their late entry or early exist from the school site. Currently, without the test, students are now eligible for Chapter 1 funded services. Under this new proposal, a greater number of our migrant students who would otherwise be excluded will be served.

The second issue in the proposed bill is the recommendation to concentrate Chapter 1 funds on areas with greatest need and greatest poverty, which are typically identified as urban areas. While we agree that funds should address students with the greatest needs, we have a concern that a majority of our migrant students statewide would not be served because they live either in rural or unincorporated areas of the county.

A third concern relative to the clustering concept is that a very small percentage of high schools receive Chapter 1 funding. When they do, they do not focus on the issue of credit accrual, yet migrant students are at risk of dropping out because they do not meet graduation requirements. Program assistance to secondary migrant students in our program has resulted in a 40 percent increase in the number graduating over the last few years.

A fourth concern involves the topic of parental involvement and parental education. District and parent advisory councils over the years have been token efforts to satisfy the law. Parent education and involvement have become meaningless activities and participation has dropped. The Migrant Education Program, on the other hand, has become the leader in encouraging and getting parents involved in their children's education. Our parent education training models are so successful that the Chapter 1 office is currently sponsoring a home/school community partnership conference to train parent teams from across the State on a parent education program originally developed by migrant education program staff.

A fifth area of concern involves the future of extended learning programs. Research has clearly established that extended time in school helps students achieve more from the regular core programs and avoids the forgetting syndrome. The Migrant Education Program offers classes before and after school and on Saturdays. It also provides engaging educational opportunities during the summer months for schools on a regular school year, and during intercessions for schools implementing a year-round education program. Chapter 1 funds generally do not flow into summer or intersession programs.

Finally, we fear that, if migrant funds or programs are clustered, that migrant children throughout the county will lose their strongest advocates. Migrant students and families have low socioeconomic status, lack English skills and are unfamiliar with our educational system. In schools, they often feel awkward and unwelcome. Migrant staff understand the obstacles and problems migrant children encounter on a daily basis and they advocate and remind the schools that they have a responsibility to serve these students, particularly when making important decisions regarding instructional programs.

I would like to share a case study of a child named Miguel. Four years ago, he and his family were on the verge of destruction. In one year Miguel had received three chemotherapy treatments and acted as his own bone marrow donor. His parents were on the verge of divorce, his oldest brother was working two jobs and failing school, his youngest brother was acting out in schools and at home. All five live in a garage transformed into a two-bedroom apartment. The family did not have sufficient money to support the impending surgery. The family was referred to our regional counselor who worked with the school, the community, and directly with the family to obtain counseling and financial support. Thanks to her loving efforts, the family stopped preparing for death, and began to embrace the world of the living members of their family, including Miguel, who survived the transplant and has graduated from high school.

Please consider the Miguels when making the decision to cluster funds. A very significant number of children and adults would be adversely affected by a decision to eliminate the protective status of the migrant funds. The need that drove Congress to fund this program is still evident. Our farms need laborers, our fish industries need migratory fisherman, and it is to society's advantage to consider their specialized needs while they are in school, rather than later in life. Many of our migrant students of yesterday are today's lawyers, doctors, researchers, scientists and educators. I thank you, again, for this opportunity to speak on behalf of the council and the students.

[Applause.]

[The prepared statement of Ms. Socea follows:]

Magdalena Arellanes Socea, Director
Migrant Education - Region X

TESTIMONY OF THE CALIFORNIA MIGRANT EDUCATION DIRECTORS' COUNCIL

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to testify on behalf of migrant children. I am Magdalena Arellanes Socea, Director of the Migrant Education program in Region X, serving Los Angeles County, and I am here representing the California Migrant Education Directors' Council. On behalf of the Council I am pleased to submit our testimony regarding the reauthorization of the Chapter I Migrant Education Program.

The California Migrant Education Directors' Council represents eighteen regional directors who are in charge of administering the Migrant Education program throughout California. Fourteen of these Regional Directors are responsible for programs with budgets and student populations larger than statewide programs in thirty other states. This Council also serves in an advisory capacity to the State Office of Migrant Education.

The Congress, through the programs in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act has provided numerous educational opportunities to the children of migrant and seasonal farm workers. The Council recognizes more needs to be done and urges the Congress to make the appropriate changes to the law, which will facilitate the delivery of educational services to these students. A copy of the Council's recommendations on the Migrant Education Programs authorized under Chapter I of ESEA, which were submitted to this Subcommittee earlier this year, are included with my written testimony.

My testimony today will focus on the concept of "clustering" proposed by Congressman Kildee and the United States Department of Education, and the legislation recently introduced by Congressmen Ford and Goodling, HR 2769.

CLUSTERING

As Regional Directors whose major responsibility is the education of migrant children, we are highly concerned by some of the proposals offered in this Reauthorization, as they will have a devastating effect on the quality of educational services provided to migrant children. The most detrimental proposal being forwarded in this reauthorization is the concept of "clustering". While there may be certain programmatic and educational rationales for clustering federal categorical funds and utilizing a "wholistic" approach in funding programs, the bottom line is that migrant students will be lost in the shuffle and excluded from services that are financed through resources that were meant to improve their education. For this reason, the California Migrant Education Director's Council opposes the "clustering" proposal under consideration by Congress and the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education.

As a way of introducing this important issue, particularly as it relates to migrant programs in California, I would like to review the findings outlined by a Statewide LEA Committee that was charged with completing a comprehensive study on the governance, management and operation of the California Migrant Education Program in 1979. A 12 point rationale was developed for a regional services delivery structure that is very germane to the clustering proposal.

The regional structure

1. Provides local control and flexibility needed to meet the unique needs of migrant students.
2. Provides a vehicle through which the State Department of Education can discharge its managerial responsibilities.
3. Helps participating school districts and other service agencies better serve migrant students.
4. Provides service to migrant children in districts where it would be economically and/or administratively difficult for the district to provide them.
5. Allows a greater percentage of the program budget to be dedicated to services to migrant children rather than to administrative costs.
6. Provide cost-effective services coordinated offer a broad area and to a large number or recipients.
7. Fulfills and advocacy role for migrant children and their families.
8. Has developed into an educational, social service, and community oriented organization.
9. Converts per-capita funding into supplementary funding.
10. Has the flexibility to reallocate resources over a broad geographic area, particularly in cases of enrollments fluctuations.
11. Recognizes the importance of well-defined, well-organized Migrant Parent Advisory Councils.
12. Is in place an functioning effectively under the supervision of Local Educational Agencies.

Statewide LEA Study Committee (1980, April). Abstract of the future of migrant education in California.

A major concern in the early 1970's which led to the development of the regional structure was that of ensuring that migrant funds followed migrant students. Prior to the implementation of this regional structure state officials found that many school districts were misusing migrant funds. The same concern still exists today. If funds are clustered into one block grant, the question is will migrant students receive services targeting their specific needs? While many school districts have made honest and significant efforts in addressing the needs of migrant and/or Limited English Proficient or LEP students through the basic program and other state categorical funds, the overall track record is quite dismal.

A review of the Coordinated Compliance Review summary for 1990-91 reveals that the most common non-compliance items statewide fell, into the category that addresses the needs of limited English proficient students. These include:

1. No written policy on Chapter I parent involvement. (31)
2. LEP students assessed in L1 within 90 calendar days of enrollment. (52)
3. Not all LP students requiring L1 academic instruction receive it. (51)
4. School site Bilingual Advisory Council not functioning as required. (37)
5. LEP students not tested in English within 30 school days by bilingual staff. (34)
6. Not all LEP students requiring English academic instruction received it. (27)
7. In adequate resources to provide bilingual learning opportunities. (26)

(Note: Numbers on the right indicate total non-compliance iincidents)

Furthermore, a review by a state education consultant of applications submitted to the California State Department of Education for restructuring grants under SB 1264 indicated that most districts failed to properly address how their schools would address the needs of LEP and culturally diverse student populations--even after the application instructions clearly asked that this issue be specifically addressed.

A second concern involves the current allocation of categorical funds within school districts. Presently in California, Chapter I funds can be consolidated in a school-based coordinated plan which concentrates the dollars to be spent at designated sites and grade levels. Out of 5,408 schools in California, 3,916 school concentrate their categorical funds at the elementary level. When this occurs the needs of the migrant child in the middle and upper grades are not addressed. In California approximately 65% of migrant students are identified as LEP. Out of the 5,408 schools LEP services are offered at 1,924 elementary schools, 387 middle schools and 262 high schools. Of the 5,408 schools, 3,227 have Migrant Programs that service migrant students' LEP needs. These Migrant Programs are in 2,383 elementary, 488 middle and 292 high schools.

If Migrant funds are clustered with Chapter I or other categorical funds, LEP migrant students in 458 elementary schools, 101 middle schools, and 30 high schools would not have their Limited English Proficiency needs met because the state had not mandated funding and consequently services would not be provided. To compound this problem most migrant students are located in rural and non-urban areas.

Thirdly, in the school-based coordinated plan which clusters compensatory funds, the local school district has the option to choose a priority area which may not coincide with migrant student needs. Secondary students would be adversely affected if migrant funds were clustered and were not targeted, as a very small percentage of high schools receive Chapter I funding. When they do, it does not focus on credit accrual. Migrant Education targets this population because they are at risk of dropping out due to graduation requirements that vary from district to district and from state to state. Migrant Education provides special supplemental services to migrant secondary students which accommodates the family travel pattern and has an established system by which these students can accrue credit for graduation. The number of migrant students graduating from secondary schools has increased by 40% over the last few years due to migrant funds being focused in this area.

A fourth concern involves the topic of parental involvement and parental education. The Migrant Education Program has been the leader in encouraging and getting parents involved in their children's education. Migrant Education has been successful in this area because it has been able to focus on the specific needs of migrant parents and their children. Meetings are conducted in the parent's home language, training topics are jointly selected with input from Parent Advisory Councils (PAC) and an emphasis is placed on "home outreach", recognizing the fact that many migrant parents do not feel comfortable (and often times have not been made to feel welcomed) in the school setting. It has been my experience that in those districts where Migrant PACs are integrated in other district or school councils, participation drops and parents feel excluded and experience a sense of disempowerment. The end result is one where parent involvement and parent education become meaningless activities, no more than token efforts to meet the letter of the law.

A fifth area of concern involves the future of extended learning programs currently provided by Migrant Education during the summer for schools on a regular school year and during intercessions for districts implementing a year round education program. Research has clearly established that students who receive extended time in school during the summer months or intersessions achieve more from the regular core programs and do not experience the "forgetting" syndrome. The Migrant Program provides engaging

educational programs throughout the summer months and intersession periods thus when students re-enter school, they need less review. Chapter One funds generally do not flow to the summer program.

Finally, we fear that if migrant funds and/or programs are clustered, migrant children throughout the country will lose their strongest advocates. The title of the report produced by the National Commission of Migrant Education. Invisible Children, captures this concern and message. Due to their transiency, their low socio-economic status, their lack of English skills and their unfamiliarity with our educational systems, migrant families live on the fringes of American society. They come and go and are indeed "invisible" to the everyday person. In schools, they often feel awkward and unwelcomed when confronted by negative subtle and overt messages from teachers, principals and secretaries. Through the migrant program, migrant children do have a voice and someone to advocate for them. Migrant staff become deeply involved with migrant students and their families. They understand the obstacles and problems migrant children encounter on a daily basis. Oftentimes, these migrant teachers, aides and administrators were themselves migrant. This strong bond, this sensitivity and knowledge of migrant students' educational needs, allow them to effectively advocate and remind schools that they have a responsibility to serve these students, particularly when making important decisions regarding instructional programs.

Please consider these and other important criteria found in my written testimoy when making the decision to cluster funds. A very significant number of children, students, and adults would be adversely affected by a decision to eliminate the protected status of migrant funds. The Migrant Program has a very specific criteria for bringing students into the program that relates directly to their parents occupation and mobility. It is a program that has served many children and families effectively for many years. The need that drove the Congress to fund this program is still evident. Our farms need laborers, our fish industries need migratory fisherman and it is to society's advantage to consider their specialized needs while they are in schools, rather than later in live. Many migrant students of yesterday are today's lawyers, doctors, researchers, scientists and educators.

Thank you for this opportunity to present the views of the California Migrant Education Directors' Council.

Other Recommendations of the California Migrant Education Directors' Council

HR 2769: A Bill to Improve Education for Migrant Children in Elementary and Secondary Schools

The Directors' Council applauds Congressmen Ford and Goodling for many of the recommended changes in their legislation and believes that these changes will ultimately provide for more focused and comprehensive services to migrant children throughout the country.

1. **Opportunities for Migrant Children to Meet Challenging Content and Performance Standards**

The Council fully supports the need to ensure that schools are held accountable for providing high quality services to migrant students that provide opportunities for migrant children to meet challenging content and performance standards required for any student. Recent studies on Chapter I programs have demonstrated that traditional remedial approaches are not enough. A stronger emphasis on program coordination, professional development for teachers and principals, as well a meaningful parent education/involvement activities, is needed if we are to ensure educational excellence for all students.

In California, numerous collaborative staff development programs for classroom teachers and principals have been developed which provide comprehensive and on-going professional development activities around content specifically aimed at improving teachers' ability to instruct migrant and limited English proficient students; i.e., second language acquisition theory and methodologies, language experience approach, sheltered instruction in the content areas, cooperative learning, etc. Most recently, collaborative efforts among migrant regional offices, county offices, and school districts have made it possible to implement instructional strategies and programs that have shown to be extremely successful with at risk migrant students. The Learning to Read Through the Arts/AVID and Reading Recovery programs are but three examples.

Migrant Education in California has been a leader in parent education. The annual State Parent Conference attracts over 700 migrant parents from all sectors of the state. The Home-School Partnership Program, developed through the State Office of Migrant Education, has been implemented in numerous school districts and is being adopted by Chapter I programs as a model for parents of Chapter I students. At the regional level parent education/involvement activities are many, ranging from simple school visitation activities to formal leadership institutes and parents as trainers programs. Congressmen Ford and Goodling's legislation provides the emphasis that is needed to promote and to require increased professional development, program coordination, and parent involvement/education.

2. **Alternative models for the Collection and Transfer of Student Data**

The Directors' Council further supports Mr. Ford's proposal for the Secretary to work with States in exploring alternative models for the collection and transfer of student data. The current process for enrolling students and maintaining and

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

exchanging student data is labor intensive and very expensive. While a centralized mainframe computer system may have appropriate 20 years age, this is no longer the case today. Advancements in personal computer technology and the introduction of fax machine and electronic data transfer systems offer alternative methods for data exchange which may prove more efficient and less costly.

The Council, however, continues to have serious concerns regarding the present regulations for enrolling students in the migrant program. The process is extremely labor intensive since it requires individual family interviews at the school or in the home. The time spent on this activity could better be used in direct instructional activities. We urge the Subcommittee to re-examine the concept of a tri-annual migrant student count that appeared in the initial draft of this legislation and/or to consider other alternatives for identifying and counting students. For example, the Office of Migrant Education could possibly allocate the Migrant appropriation by using the Chapter I state allocation rations and applying some statistical caveats from the Department of Labor's National Agricultural Workers Survey or another type of census.

3. **Consortium Agreements**

The provision for consortium agreements among states for the delivery of services will reduce administrative overhead and will result in more direct services to children.

4. **Summer Program Formula**

Congressmen Ford and Goodling's bill amends Section 1202(b)(4) - Amounts of Grant to States to consider intercession programs in calculating the summer funding formula. The Directors" Council strongly support this change to the summer formula and recommends that this change be required by the Secretary rather than simply permitting it. We recommend the following language change:

> Section 1202 (b)(4). The Secretary shall develop a formula for adjusting the estimated number of children who reside in a State in order to reflect the number of migrant children who are served in summer programs (which ~~may~~ shall include intercession programs) in the State...

A large number of California's schools have converted to year-round education (YRE) calendars and presently, approximately 25 percent of our migrant students attend YRE schools. While these students benefit immensely from services provided through intercession programs, California receives zero funding for such services. We have argued that the California Migrant Education Program has been underfunded because of the limited "summer funding window" of May 15 to August 31. If the summer window for 1993-94 had been expanded to include FTE generated during intercession programs, California's allocation would have been increased by $4.6 million.

5. **24 Month Eligibility**

While the Council supports the need to focus our services on the "true migratory student", it urges the Subcommittee to reconsider its position and extend eligibility beyond the proposed 24 month period for the following reasons.

a. Migrant students continue to exhibit the same or increased levels of need, particularly in language and reading, long after they stop migrating.

The 3-year study conducted by Research Triangle Associates (RTI) identified eight characteristics associated with need for special education services; behind grade level; high absentee rate; eligible for Chapter I; eligible for free or reduced-priced meals; severe behavioral problems; reading level below the 35th percentile; language arts below the 35th percentile; and mathematics level below the 35th percentile. Seventy-five (75) percent of migrant students exhibited at least two of the eight indicators and 25 percent exhibited five or more. RTI's research showed that the need for some special instructional services decreases the longer migrant students are settled out. However, formerly migrant students continue to exhibit elevated levels of need, particularly in language and reading.

b. Former migrant students have been excluded and will continue to be excluded from Chapter I services.

While the intent and concept of transitioning former migrant students into Chapter I programs is needed, and should be presently occurring without new legislation or mandates, this change will not occur overnight. State guidelines and several longstanding practices in the Chapter I program perpetuate the exclusion of former migrant students.

Criteria for student eligibility has often been a key factor in the exclusion of migrant students for Chapter I services. For example, presently Chapter I funds require students to be tested annually on a standardized test in order to qualify for services. These tests are usually given in the spring or fall of the year, a time when the migrant families are on the move. Schools test only those students who have received a minimum of thirty days of instruction in that school, which is approximately one and one-half months. This testing requirement eliminates migrant students from the test because of their late entry or early exist from the school site. Without the test scores, students are not eligible for Chapter I funded services.

A large and significant percentage of Chapter I categorical funds are focused on the large urban areas because of the identified poverty level. This disproportionately affects the migrant student; while they are poor, they are the working poor and do not generate funding. They do not generally receive public assistance and thus do not trigger funding commensurate with their need. Frequently migrant families do not apply for "Aide to Families of Dependent Children" for fear that their permanent citizenship status may be adversely affected.

Chapter I program emphasis on English arts and mathematics combined with migrant students' lack of English proficiency provide a second major reason for this exclusion. Chapter I programs have traditionally been established to remediate students' deficiencies in the core academic subject areas: reading,

math and language arts. Instruction in these programs is typically provided by monolingual English speaking teachers or aides in English. In California approximately 60 percent of our K-12 migrant student population is limited English proficient. A primary need for these students is obviously intensive English as a second language (ESL) and language development. Unfortunately, Chapter I programs have neither perceived nor assumed this need as being their responsibility.

The National Commission's Migrant education (1992) shared these sentiments in their report Invisible Children. The Commission noted:

Participation of MEP children in Chapter I programs may be limited because:

- state rules may prohibit participation in more than one supplementary program;
- the way programs are designed may exclude children with limited-English skills;
- MEP children are not enrolled in a school or in a grade where Chapter I services are provided; and
- MEP children do not meet the eligibility cut-off for services.

c. Chapter I programs lack the resources to serve all eligible students.

While we support and desire to collaborate with Chapter I programs to ensure that formerly migrant students benefit from Chapter I and other categorical program services, the reality is that Chapter I does not have the resources to serve all eligible students in need. Reference has been made in other testimony that Chapter I serves approximately 44 percent of its eligible population (Miller, 1993). Is it realistic to think that Chapter I programs would automatically be able to serve the additional tens of thousands of formerly migrant students who are exited from the migrant program because of a change in regulations? I think not. Also, Chapter I funds have always been concentrated in urban areas. If Congress re-directs the Chapter I formula to place more funding in high-concentrated poverty areas, which are typically urban, migrant students enrolled in rural schools will again be excluded.

d. Lastly, a central question in the discussion regarding the reduction in eligibility is the following: How does a former migrant student differ from a Chapter I student? If there aren't any significant differences, the argument is that these students should be served by Chapter I and that Migrant Education should solely concentrate its efforts on students during their first two years after establishing eligibility. If this were the case, I would not be testifying here today. I believe there are some unique differences.

While formerly migrant and Chapter I students both suffer from academic deficiencies and both require academic remediation, the language factor must be considered. I previously made reference to the high concentration of LEP migrant students in California. The numbers of LEP formerly migrant students are just as high (67%) when compared to the currently migrant population. Research by Cummins, Krashen, Wong-Fillmore and others consistently indicates that it takes a student at least three years before s/he becomes academically proficient in a second language. The lack of English

language skills put the formerly migrant students at a greater risk of failing in school.

While this limited English proficiency additionally impedes a formerly migrant student's education, the lack of English skills among their parents, only compounds the educational problem. The inability to communicate in English, often prohibits migrant parents from visiting schools, attending parent-teacher conferences, and communicating with teachers and principals when problems or other issues arise. This lack of English skills also limits their ability to access educational and community resources which could contribute to their children's success in school. Lack of bilingual staff in schools only exacerbates this situation. Migrant education staff has played a major role in bridging the home-school-community gap for formerly migrant families.

Secondly, while both formerly migrant and Chapter I students suffer from economic disadvantages, the formerly migrant students must contend with educational barriers that stem from institutional discrimination due to cultural differences and their migrant lifestyle. In California, over 95 percent of the migrant student population is Hispanic. Carlos Cortes, from the University of California at Riverside, has extensively researched factors which influence the education of minority students within a wider socio-cultural framework. Cortes argues that certain educational input factors such as teacher and administrator attitudes, expectations and beliefs about their students are perhaps more important than the actual instructional treatments' i.e., tutoring, in determining a student's educational success.

A major role of migrant staff is working to change negative teacher attitudes about migrant students--this requires sensitizing, educating to dispel misconceptions, and enabling teachers with skills and strategies that will help them provide a more appropriate instructional programs. Unfortunately, these socio-cultural factors, which can negatively impact a migrant student's educational success, are only heightened by the current wave of immigrant bashing.

For these reasons, the Directors' Council urges you to reconsider the proposal to reduce the eligibility to 24 months. We propose the two amendments to the following sections of HR 2769:

SECTION 1204. COORDINATION OF MIGRANT EDUCATION ACTIVITIES

(c) CONTINUATION OF SERVICES--(1) Subject of paragraph (2), a child who is no longer a migrant child in the transitional 4th year of eligibility may continue to receive services for one additional school year during the 4th year only if comparable services are not available provided through other programs. (p.9)

(e) DEFINITION--...and who has moved within the past 24 48 months--(p.10)

Mr. BECERRA. Thank you very much. Let me yield to my colleague, Congresswoman Woolsey, for any questions, and let her begin with her questions.

Ms. WOOLSEY. I feel like a bully. I would like to address Ms. Fores, not Cassandra, at all. That was a really good testimony. My understanding of the ESEA reform is to concentrate Chapter 1 funding on teacher education. Not Chapter 1, I am sorry—Chapter 2. I said the wrong thing. Chapter 2 funding on teacher education, will that help in your concerns with bringing——

Ms. FLORES. I think anything will help at this point, especially programs such as Migrant, which, by the way, I am also involved in. My esteemed colleague hit the name on the head. We have resources there. Those people are out there. We just need to capitalize on them and provide a structure for them to be channeled into the teaching profession. Any help coming from the Ford Foundation to the government would be more than welcome.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Well, then, any of you who would like to respond to this, and then I will yield to your representative. The National Services Program is all about helping students and providing them with jobs and social services that are needed in our communities. Wouldn't this be a good link that—while encouraging a young person to go into education, encourage him at the same time to become an aide—bilingual aide, and make that connection? Maybe they would carry that out into their future?

Mr. GENZUK. Yes. I think it is a natural link. It is something that we have been looking towards to creating this career pathway, not only for high school students, which was mentioned earlier in testimony, but also to the community where they would become, for example, paraeducators. They would go through that thorough a graduated scale, where they would become more successful, receive this money and then be able to enter into the institutions of higher education to further education.

The big impediment has really been financial. The will has been there, the skill has been there. The problem is that this particular portion of the population just cannot afford to spend their money on higher education. They are more concerned about putting food in their mouth and keeping a roof over their head. So, it seems like a natural, as long as there is a portion that is—for example assumption loans have been a very successful vehicle that has been used in legislation previously, where they were given a loan, in essence, as long as they completed their connection with this and they went out and they provided these services in the community, then a portion of those loans were assumed so that the community benefited from that. I think it would be terrific. It seems like a natural to me.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Okay. Good.

Mr. BECERRA. Let me ask a couple of questions. As I think more of us are now becoming more informed, the President has proposed health care reform. He has talked about the need to make sure that all children have an opportunity to have a chance to learn, that they be screened before they go on to school for any health abnormalities. Let me ask the three panelists whether or not any cost for providing health screening which under the administration's proposal for ESEA would be mandatory, which is not now, but

would be—but any costs for these types of health programs, whether it is health screening or beyond, whether that should be a cost incurred by the education side of the government through ESEA or through the health side of the government, the health care reform proposal?

Ms. SOCEA. I would like to speak from the Migrant Education perspective. We offer a variety of health services to our migrant families, students and families. What we do is we provide them with the resources and help them access what resources are available in the community already. There are many community services that are available at no cost or very, very minimal cost.

The need is out there for those services. There are families who would warrant that all of the costs be spent by the government basically, but there are some families who could, at a very minimal amount, pay some of their health care. I think that a commitment comes also when we generate a little bit of our resources for services, as long as it is not taxing that family. I think it gives them a feeling of participation and a feeling of contribution for their own family needs.

Mr. GENZUK. I think, again, it comes back to our talk of coordinated services. It seems to me it does not have to be an either/or proposition. I know, for example, with the population that I deal with, in most cases, none of them have health care services. It is a tremendous impediment because, if they get sick or their children get sick, they can no longer attend classes, they can no longer attend work, and it creates tremendous roadblocks. Is there not some vehicle where we can coordinate those services so that maybe it does not all come out of one pot or the other, but that they share those? I think that that is the way we have to go.

Mr. BECERRA. One last question. In the discussion of teacher training for bilingual education, obviously we all discussed the numbers—there are insufficient numbers of teachers who are out there ready to prepare to teach bilingual education. Is there anything in the current system which provides an incentive for a teacher to become a bilingual instructor, versus just a monolingual English instructor? If not, what could we do to make sure that we do provide some incentive?

Mr. GENZUK. It depends on the district that you are in. For example, Los Angeles Unified has a very strong incentive. It is a monetary incentive. The problem is that it has been counteracted by the enormous numbers of responsibilities that come along with that remuneration of money. Bilingual teachers not only have to be bilingual, but they have to be familiar with two sets of the curriculum, they have to conduct the interviews with parents that the monolingual teachers cannot. In most cases, they are translating notices that go home. They are basically doubling their work output for a mere $5,000 a year extra. Now, on the surface, that may seem like a lot, but it is not.

I think that the incentives that are needed, besides the monetary incentives, are more effective incentives. I think they, one, need to be recognized that they are such an integral part. Second, I think we need to break down the existing atmosphere towards bilingual education. It is looked at so negatively that a lot of people may have those skills and choose not to highlight them to future em-

ployers because they do not want to get stuck doing all of the extra work. So, I think that you need to find additional incentives besides economic incentives.

Ms. SOCEA. Can I comment on that?

Mr. BECERRA. Yes, please.

Ms. SOCEA. I see it also as two ways, at kind of opposite ends here. On the one hand, I think an incentive in this county is that you get a chance to work with our kids. On the other hand, I see an incentive as helping teachers to do better at teaching. Because, with that skill, then they are able to reach more children and do a more effective job as the teacher.

Mr. BECERRA. Thank you.

Ms. Woolsey, any further comments?

Ms. WOOLSEY. Well, I just wanted to say that the leader on our Education and Labor subcommittee on this issue is your representative, and he is really well-spoken and he reflects your thinking, and he will bring all of us along, believe me. So, we have got a lot of work to do, but I pledge to work with Congressman Becerra on this.

Mr. BECERRA. Now you know why I brought Ms. Woolsey down here today.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Oh, well.

Ms. SOCEA. We all need that.

Mr. BECERRA. I should mention to folks, Congresswoman Woolsey was very gracious to mention that I was recently awarded with an award as one of the distinguished freshman members in the education field up in Washington, DC in Congress. What she failed to mention was that there was a coawardee for that distinction, and that was Lynn Woolsey, who also was awarded the honor.

[Applause.]

Mr. BECERRA. I thank the three of you, and the six who came and testified on the panel on ESEA. Now we are going to move on to the third panel. So, thank you all for the testimony. You are welcome to stay.

We will have about a minute or two break, please. I would appreciate it if you would not leave your seats, because we are going to try to finish up on time.

[Recess.]

Mr. BECERRA. Okay. If we could have everyone please take their seats? We are going to go ahead and start with our final panel. Our final panel will deal with not necessarily in-classroom education; but we thought it was very important to have some testimony on all aspects of education. I think that, to my left, we have a Member of Congress who has shown such a great interest in making sure children succeed. One of I think the beauties of being in Congress is to be with people who recognize that you go beyond just the three Rs. Congresswoman Woolsey has done a tremendous job not only in advocating for extra services within the classroom, but also understands that we have to go beyond and probe to find out exactly what those services are. So, I am very pleased to have the three panelists that we have today.

So, let me begin on our third panel, involving youth alternatives and preschool options, with Mr. Richard Shumsky, the President of LA County Probation Officers Union. Of course, Ms. Molina—Su-

pervisor Molina made reference to the program which he directs. Mr. Shumsky, thank you very much for being here.

STATEMENTS OF RICHARD NEIL SHUMSKY, PRESIDENT, LOS ANGELES COUNTY PROBATION DEPARTMENT UNION, LOCAL 685; CARLOS C. BARRON, SCHOOL DIRECTOR, EDUTRAIN CHARTER SCHOOL 17; AND PAT GRIFFITH, COFOUNDER, MT. WASHINGTON PRESCHOOL AND CHILD CARE CENTER

Mr. SHUMSKY. Thank you for inviting me. Supervisor Molina gave my speech, so let me be very brief. We are very proud of our camp system in Los Angeles County. Last year, due to a severe budget crisis, we were served notice that our camps would be closed. The Union, with help from elected officials, such as Gloria Molina, and it was then Assemblyman Xavier Becerra, now Congressman, secured funding both in Washington and in the State of California. We were very pleased with our participation. I think it shows that solutions can be realized after various government jurisdictions formed creative partnerships to solve a common problem.

Once again, Los Angeles faces a similar crisis, and that is safety in the schools. The County of Los Angeles, has been solely funding a school crime suppression program which has provided probational officers on 20 high-risk campuses in Los Angeles. At its inception several years ago, it was the hope of all of us involved that more schools would be added to the program. Now, with the decrease in county funds, the mere survival of the original program is in doubt.

The Board of Supervisors, once again, is seeking a formal funding partnership. However, thus far, Los Angeles Unified and Los Angeles City have been unable to identify funds due to their own severe budget shortfalls. We are hoping that the Federal Government, under the omnibus crime bill, will be able to fund and monitor and evaluate the continuation of the school crime suppression program. It is our premise that having a probation officer on school campuses will help create an environment conducive to learning.

It is a reality that all student bodies include young men and women on probation for law violations. This is based on the fact that we supervise 40,000 juveniles in Los Angeles County. The probation officer's duties on campus include enforcing conditions of probation, as ordered by judges, as well as facilitating communications between the courts, police and schools.

We all acknowledge the importance of educating our youth. It is our hope that we can find innovate ways of funding a program which can make our local campuses a more protected environment so that education can be foremost in the minds of pupils and teachers alike.

Thank you.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Shumsky, thank you very much for your testimony.

Let's move on now to Mr. Carlos Barron, who has extensive experience in the area of education, both as a teacher/administrator, and now as the director of a very innovative program, EDUTRAIN. Thank you very much, Carlos, for being here with us.

Mr. BARRON. Thank you. Esteemed members of the committee, fellow panelists and audience, I have been asked to provide testimony with regard to the reauthorization of Chapter 1 in the area of "alternative education." After a review of the history and the literature of this Act, I can only conclude that the alternative education programs fall within the purview of its third purpose, or innovative educational approaches. Yet, the populations most served by alternative education programs mirror the same poor schoolage, low-achieving, neglected and delinquent children from relative low-income neighborhoods identified under Chapter 1.

I offer you one approach gathered from the many approaches which are inherent to the many years of experimentation afforded the alternative education arena. Yet, I say this not as an approach to be considered out of the mainstream, but perhaps as a future alternative to the present condition of public education in this Nation.

Much can be said in favor of the American public school system and of its youth. The school system is close to achieving its idea of universal education, an ideal that has been enriched, as we have become ever more culturally and linguistically plural. While other more homogeneous countries concentrate their resources on the intellectual elite, we offer a quality education to all.

The American master students are often compared unfavorably and unfairly with the elite 10 percent of students from other countries, and yet statistics show that many achieve nearly as well as their few. These achievements are considerable, despite popular stereotypes of young people as a troubled generation on the skids, a close look at the statistics show otherwise.

The vast majority of young people today are staying in school longer, working at one or more jobs to make ends meet, avoiding premature marriages and child-rearing, moving from addictive drugs, and striving to be successful in an intensely competitive economy. These young people deserve our respect and, in some cases, need our assistance. They do not need the condemnation nor the benign neglect of our older generations.

Even in light of these accomplishments, there are always some students whose needs do not seem to be met by regular schooling. Traditional educational approaches often do not have the resources or the versatility to provide the optimal learning environment for these students, who then fall short of product levels, which traditional models define as successful. That such students do fall short should not be construed as a criticism of traditional schools and methods, but as an observation.

Unconventional students need flexible and unconventional pedagogy, systems, and perhaps institutions. Students who leave school before graduation will find themselves outside the boundaries of traditional education because of pregnancy, family pressures or other problems are the best examples of those whose needs are not met by current strategies. It is this population in whom we are most interested and it would be best served by a chartered school like EDUTRAIN. These are students who are not currently served by any school or program, since they do not attend school. They are a population poorly described in the educational literature. As a cohort, their characteristics have not been researched, and their

needs have not been identified, nor is there a model or documented precedent to give us a definitive picture of the kind of school system that works for those who do not go to school.

What is clear is that the unique cohort requires a unique response. After decades of back-to-basic curricula, tough love, or any of the other platitudes frequently offered as panaceas, it is evident that those monolithic approaches are far too simple to address the varied and complex needs of what is a very diverse group of students.

I advocate, therefore, a multifaceted educational response. EDUTRAIN has developed such a response in the form of flexible, self-paced curricula, flexible, individualized schedules, high-level technological training, built-in ethical training, child care programs, coordinated health and professional school link services; programs including self-esteem and a general pedagogic philosophy of holistic education towards self-sufficiency and responsibility.

EDUTRAIN's efforts are offered not in place of other more traditional schools, but as an augmentation of educational options or, at best, a parallel institution. More needs can be met if more schooling options are available. Only then does the American ideal of universal education have a greater chance of being realized. Moreover, in an experiment such as EDUTRAIN's, there is nothing to lose and everything to gain.

The students we serve and seek to serve are already outside the school. Existing models appear to be failing them. By promoting an approach and serving their needs, we are at least committing ourselves to the belief that education is a right for all children, even the nontraditional and underserved.

That there are students who are underserved in our vast public school system is without question. It would be unconscionable for anyone in public education having laid claim to the philosophy of education for all to deny it to one group. Acknowledging that existing models are inappropriate for some, the ethical educator must allow for alternative means of implementing and assessing the way we teach our children. If universal education is our goal, let us move closer to it, and let the EDUTRAIN project broaden the impact of our common dream.

I hope this introduction serves to raise the kinds of questions and issues which will be further illuminated in the efforts made by EDUTRAIN and in the accomplishments we are trying to make in serving the at-risk student in this Nation.

Thank you.

Mr. BECERRA. Thank you, Mr. Barron.

Let me move on now with a final panelist who will provide some testimony. It is interesting, although the final person to testify, we are really back to the beginning of where we should start when it comes to education, and that is with our youth at the very earliest of stages, before they actually enter kindergarten. So, with that, let me make sure I introduce to you Ms. Pat Griffith, someone who has been very active in the Los Angeles community for many years and is also the cofounder of the Mount Washington Preschool, which is no more than about three to five miles from here.

Pat, thank you very much for coming.

Ms. GRIFFITH. Thank you very much. I am really pleased to be here. We are very proud of our organization and our achievements, because we are a community and parent-based group. Our goal was to develop more quality preschool education for the children in our community. We started about four years ago with about 20 parents who personally were experiencing lack of preschool availability. We have now, through outreach have reached out to a true cross-section of the community. We have retirees, child care activists, parents, of course, and individuals who are interested in the preservation and development of our community alone.

Apart from providing quality care and education, another goal is to increase the attention that government pays to families—to very young children and to the families of those very young children. So, we are striving to create a supportive atmosphere for those families and to unite them, give them a sense of community, and give them a voice.

We perceive our mission is to develop or open a new child care center. In doing that, we have looked at a variety of options. We have tried working with the city on developing city-owned property. We have looked extensively for space in underused churches or in existing commercial space. We have also just supported the surrounding available care.

We have found the opening of a child care center was actually very difficult, as we have been told. So, I would like to share with you some of the successes we have had and some of the difficulties.

Our first problem was, of course, money. We are a traditional community organization. We have raised our money in the traditional ways. We have held children's festivals, we have held bake sales, we have held dances, we have held a variety of organizations. Our perception is that we could have solved any of our problems if we had had a quarter of a million dollars available to us somehow or other.

The other problem we faced is that it has been very difficult to find a site. We are located in Northeast Los Angeles, and we are blessed with a wealth of stately and charming old churches and older houses from the earlier part of the century. Unfortunately, this charm is also somewhat of a curse, because, while many churches have been eager to have a child care center use the property during the week, the structural modifications needed to meet current fire and occupancy regulations placed those sites out of our price range. In general, preserving our architectural heritage is just a huge expense for a small child care center to come up with. As people have suggested to us, tearing the old buildings down and putting up trailers is an affordable option, but we did not perceive it as a good one.

Some of our successes. Our number one success is that we have garnered tremendous community involvement in our work. Despite the fact that we have little money, all of those bake sales have paid off by providing us with the support. Once we have finally secured a lease in the only modern church in our area, our six weeks of play-yard construction brought out literally the most talented and underused volunteer carpenters, slab corps, furniture makers, landscape architects, cooks, anything.

While it is sometimes difficult for the average parent or the average community member to raise enthusiasm for another bylaws meeting, the chance to create a tangible asset for our community is attractive and compelling. Once the center was open and we sat down to add up the hours and the value of those hours, we added it up that it was somewhere between $60,000 and $100,000 worth of donations, mostly in time and labor.

Another success has been attracting quality staff. We have heard that it is very difficult to find quality preschool education and we have a parent and community committee working on advertising and interviewing teachers, and we have met with quite a few people who have little qualification for preschool teaching. However, there are highly-trained and warm and creative teachers in the field. We are very pleased with the staff we have got.

Our community is multilingual. We have many families that—probably a predominance of non-English speaking families speaking Spanish, but we also serve an Asian population. Our host church is Egyptian and speak Arabic. We need bilingual teachers to serve those children. The other thing is that preschool children do not walk to school on their own. Twice a day we meet with the parents or an adult responsible for their child. We need a bilingual teacher who is able to communicate effectively and work with the parents, and for us all to work together.

Fortunately, and to our surprise, many bilingual individuals have gone into early childhood education. Three-quarters of our staff speak English and Spanish, and one teacher speaks English and Mandarin Chinese.

Our other success had been enrollment. Of course, when you open a preschool, what if you threw a party and no one comes? Our needs assessments have proved accurate. The enrollment is actually double what we felt we would have achieved at this stage, so we are very pleased with that.

Some of the ongoing problems, and I would like to—as we perceive them, and I would like to share them quickly. Serving the working poor. Child care is actually very expensive. In Los Angeles County, the median cost for full day care, full, five days a week is about $5,500 dollars a year. Many families just cannot afford such things. Single mothers in pink-collar jobs are rarely assisted through existing subsidies. Median income families with two young children find that it just does not pay—they just cannot afford it. Early childhood education is valuable for the child, and child care is valuable for the business community and for the parents, and yet the cost limits the families who are able to utilize it. In the end, only higher income families and the lowest income families are able to afford it.

We are also dismayed that our teachers and our aides are paid approximately half of what they would earn in the school district and if they worked for LA Unified. We are open from early in the morning until 6:30 at night, to meet the needs of working parents, and our staff is professionally-educated and experienced. What we feel is that, in the end, our major source of subsidy has come from those individuals that teach at our school. Our suggestion for improving care and education for our country's very young children are to provide financial assistance for site development.

The child care and preschool education is part of our country's infrastructure, and we should consider that. We should provide financial assistance for low-income families who are not on AFDC. Right now, the money available for assistance for child care is very limited and really only assists families who are currently on AFDC to get them off; but then there is no support to keep them off AFDC. Provide, in general, greater funding for preschool education. The cost of child care and the cost of supporting professional teachers in the field is just very expensive and will always limit the availability as a result of that.

Finally, to improve standards. Our parents worked very hard to develop child care, partially because there is so little child care available and the waiting lists are so long, but also because some of the existing centers provide little to stimulate or even adequately protect the children that are there. Preschool education is not simply babysitting the children. They need age-appropriate activities and materials in order to develop and grow.

Current California licensing regulations really only address the physical space, in ensuring that it is physically safe, rather than the quality of the education provided. Federal standards would assist us, as parents, in attaining quality care for our children.

Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Griffith follows:]

TESTIMONY TO THE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

October 4, 1993

by Pat Griffith
Mt. Washington Preschool and Child Care Center
4900 Cleland Ave.
Los Angeles, CA 90042

I am one of the founders of Mt. Washington Preschool and Child Care, a community preschool development organization, and we have just opened our first preschool on June 17, 1993. We are extremely proud of the success of this organization. We started about four years ago with a group of 20 parents, as a response to the lack of quality preschool and child care in our area. Through outreach, we now comprise a true cross section of the community, with substantial participation from retirees, child care activists, parents (of course) and individuals interested in the preservation and improvement of the community.

Apart from providing quality care and education, another major goal is to create a supportive environment for families with very young children, to unite these families and give them a political voice, to recreate a climate of respect for parents with young children, and to increase the attention our government pays to very young children.

Our principal tool for serving these families has been to increase both the quantity and quality of care and education for their children. We have pursued a variety of options, including:

working with the city on developing city-owned property into a child care center;
renting space in empty commercial property or underused churches to open a new center;
and simply supporting existing non-profit centers and family daycare providers.

Opening a new daycare center has proved to be as difficult as existing centers promised us it would be, and I would like to detail for the Committee some of the successes and difficulties we experienced.

Problems

1. Money

Unfortunately, this must come as the number one problem. Our overall impression was that there were few problems we couldn't have solved quickly if only we had had $250,000 in our bank account. As we are a community organization, we have raised our start-up funds from our members and neighbors, using all the methods community groups have used for decades, such as children's festivals, flea markets, bake sales, dances, memberships, raffles, etc. Three years of work garnered us $15,000 in the bank, which anyone can tell you is not enough capital for

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

any startup organization.

2. A Site

We are located in Northeast Los Angeles, just outside of the inner city, with a wealth of stately and charming old churches and houses from the early part of the century. Unfortunately, such charm has proved to be a curse. While many churches have been eager to have a child care center use the property during the week, the structural modifications needed to meet current fire and occupancy regulations placed the site out of our price range. In general, older property needs hundreds of thousands of dollars to preserve our architectural heritage. As many have suggested to us, "tearing the old buildings down and putting up trailers" is the most likely option. I hope you understand the loss that this "affordable" approach would bring to our community.

Successes:

1. Community Involvement

Despite the fact we had little money, our years of bake sales and children's festivals had brought us an asset which has made start-up possible: community support. Once we finally secured a lease in the only modern church in the area, our six weeks of playyard construction brought out the most talented and underused volunteer carpenters, slab pourers, furniture makers, landscape architects and cooks imaginable. While it is sometimes difficult to raise enthusiasm for a "by-laws" meeting, the chance to create a tangible asset for the community is actually attractive and compelling to many people. Once the center was opened and we sat down to add up the hours donated, we realized that our volunteers' hours added up to more than $100,000 in meeting the start-up costs.

2. Quality Staff

As we had heard, there are limited well qualified teachers in preschool education. Our hiring committee works hard, both in advertising for teachers and interviewing a large number of people with little qualification for preschool teaching. However, there <u>are</u> highly trained, warm, creative teachers in the field, and while we have not been able to attract every one of the best, we are thrilled with the teachers who have come to us.

Because so many of the families in our area do not speak English at home, or at all, we need bilingual teachers. Fortunately, many bilingual individuals have gone into early childhood education. Three-quarters of our staff speak English and Spanish, and one lead teacher speaks English and Chinese.

3. Enrollment

Our needs assessments have proven to be true: there is a great need for both preschool education and child care in our area. Our enrollment is approximately double that which we had estimated for this early in our growth.

On-going Problems:

1. Serving the Working Poor.

The unavoidable fact is that child care is very expensive. Given a Los Angeles County median cost of about $5,500 per year to provide full-day care for one child, many parents are forced out of the workforce because they do not earn enough to warrant such an expense. Single mothers in "pink-collar" jobs are rarely assisted through existing government subsidies. Yet they have so little left over after the child care costs, that they cannot afford to continue to work. Moderate income families often find care for two children is prohibitively expensive. Early childhood education is valuable for the child, and child care is valuable for our business world, yet the cost limits the families who are able to utilize it. In the end, only the higher income and lowest income families can afford child care.

Apart from applying for existing sources of subsidies, we fundraise throughout the community to increase the number of scholarships we can offer. And while businesses and community organizations are happy to donate to such a fund, the cost of child care is so large that such fundraising is daunting. It is difficult to tell a business that their $100 donation will subsidize only one child, for only a few weeks.

2. Underpaying our staff:

We are dismayed that our teachers and aides are paid approximately half of that which they would earn if they taught in the public elementary school system. Because all preschool staff do accept such low wages, median costs of preschool care can be kept down to the current [high] amount. In effect, quality teachers are providing a direct subsidy to a center that the government or business world has been unwilling to provide.

Our child care center serves preschool-aged children in the Northeast Los Angeles area, which is predominately low- to moderate-income and ethnically mixed. We are open from early in the morning until 6:30 pm. to meet the needs of working (and commuting) parents. Our staff is professional, educated and experienced. We serve children of all religions, races, ethnicities, languages and family economic levels. We currently provide some subsidized care through our

fundraising, and we hope to increase this to 50% of our children. Our curriculum is a developmental program, as requested by the parents involved in the formation of the center, and parents and community members serve in all aspects of decision making and maintenance of the center.

Our suggestions for improving the care and education for our country's young children are many:

1. **Provide financial assistance for site development.**

Given the enormous difficulty in finding an affordable site - one that meets child care licensing regulations and modern occupancy code - renovation costs and site development funding cannot fit into the average child care start-up budget. We watch with dismay as our historical gems are deemed too expensive for child care. Yet, if they could be renovated for any purpose at all, often the cost of using that space for child care is little beyond the other renovation costs. We, as a nation, need to consider space for child care as part of our infrastructure, and work to create useable child care space in all areas, not just in modern construction.

2. **Provide financial assistance for low-income families not on AFDC.**

Current guidelines for the Welfare Reform Act and for state assistance programs assist the parents attempting to get off AFDC. For the parents who have a poorly-paid job, however, there is little financial assistance for child care available to them. Direct child care subsidies allow low-wage earners to stay in the work force and off welfare, while ensuring care for our nation's children. We need to expand our ability to subsidize child care until the family income reaches a greater percentage of the median family income as a means of keeping families off welfare.

3. **Provide greater funding for preschool education.**

If a preschool teacher's salary must be held to a low level in order to make child care affordable to the average family, then our dedicated teachers will always be driven out of preschool education. Yet we know the value of early childhood education, and we know that quality care depends on the individuals in the classroom. We must provide some financial support for preschool education to keep good teachers in the field and to allow the general population to be able to afford it.

4. **Improve standards.**

Our parents were motivated to work to develop a child care center, partially because there is little in the area, but partially because many of our nearby centers provide little to stimulate or

even adequately protect the children. Preschool education is not simply babysitting the children. Children need age-appropriate materials and activities in order to develop and grow. Current California licensing regulations really only address physical space, rather than the quality of education provided. Federal standards would assist parents in obtaining quality care for their children.

Thank you.

Pat Griffith, MWPCCC
Testimony to the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education
October 4, 1993

Mr. BECERRA. Thank you very much.

Let me turn to my colleague, Ms. Woolsey, for any questions she may have.

Ms. WOOLSEY. I am looking at your EDUTRAIN. One of the things we are faced with right away now is welfare reform. One of the concerns I have in welfare reform is how are we going to train individuals that are a part of generational welfare families, not the person needing a safety net, but the institutionalized welfare recipient, a small portion of welfare recipients. Do you think EDUTRAIN would be—that approach would be a good model for—even though these are adults, to help them out of welfare and into the work world, through training?

Mr. BARRON. I believe some of those programs might be appropriate. What I find in my clients is that most—especially the females, are reluctant to go on welfare. In fact, they are involuntarily emancipated minors. In other words, they have been thrown out of their homes with their children. They live wherever they can. They are reluctant to take any kind of assistance, and yet they go from place to place seeking odd jobs or odd kinds of child care, and they are coming back to school to me. I provide child care for all of my students, one-third of which are all teenage mothers. So, those assistance programs are fine.

What I find is that when they go to those institutions, they are not very well-received, because the regulations are very direct, in terms of who qualifies. The reception is less than humane. The regulations are there to reinforce that kind of behavior towards those young persons. More importantly, they, themselves, do not have the social graces to fight for their own rights and their own privileges. It is real difficult.

Some of the things that we do are just those kinds of things—how to go in for not only an employment interview, but how to get your needs addressed, because there are programs, for instance, for some of the prenatal care for some of the early infant care that they, regardless of their emancipation, they are entitled to. It is real difficult. Certainly, my program can do that. To the extent that we do, we do offer child development courses and infant study courses, and courses in terms—just like that—how to be in the real world, since they already are in the real world.

Ms. WOOLSEY. So, I think you are telling me, yes, that this approach could work. We are talking about welfare reform, we are not talking about taking what we have got and forcing it into it.

Mr. BARRON. Right. I am talking specifically reform, and yet, I do not know if I am the authority to say how they should look. I would say absolutely, it would have to be a reform. It could not be a rehashing of what presently exists.

Ms. WOOLSEY. No. No. Okay. Good. I thank you. You have given me something to look at that makes good sense.

Richard, what is the ratio of male and female approximately in your program, your youth camp?

Mr. SHUMSKY. Currently, we have one girls' camp.

Ms. WOOLSEY. One girls' camp. One out of 20?

Mr. SHUMSKY. Actually, I think one out of 19. We have 100 girls in our camp program.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Uh-huh. That is then what Supervisor Molina was talking about—the training programs that are very labor intensive, it seemed like. So, the young people are participating in those programs too?

Mr. SHUMSKY. It is education I think. Most of our camps are geared toward education. We are served very well by the Los Angeles County schools, so we are very pleased. We begin at age 13, and then go to 18. So, the older kids are in combination emancipation, education and drop training, while the younger kids are exclusively education.

Mr. BARRON. May I add something?

Ms. WOOLSEY. Sure.

Mr. BARRON. The present Chapter 1 bill does not—the moneys that they get for Chapter 1 while they are incarcerated does not follow them to the community schools. It does not follow the pregnant mother or the pregnant minor. It does not follow the juvenile offender, and many of which are in my school. So, they are excluded from Chapter 1 funding. That is something I would love to see revisited and changed and authorized, in terms of the new reauthorization.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Okay. That is good. I have two other questions.

Richard, how are the other communities learning about the successes of your program? It is important. We have successful programs around the country and nobody knows—they all reinvent their own wheel.

Mr. SHUMSKY. Well, that is true. The Federal Government has some experimental programs for new and innovative programs in other jurisdictions that are coming up with the camps and qualifying for innovative funds. President Clinton is talking about boot camps for young adult offenders. I think that the camp philosophy probably will be adopted throughout the United States. It is a costly program, but it far less costly than incarceration and prisons. We can probably about, on an annualized basis, about $16,000 for each minor in the traditional costs in prisons—vary from $30,000 to $40,000 annually. So, it is cheaper and far more productive.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Well, let me encourage you to take advantage of the moneys through the Goals 2000 that will be available to provide you with some dollars to write up your program——

Mr. SHUMSKY. We shall.

Ms. WOOLSEY. [continuing] so that others can learn from it. You talked about probation officers. Are you talking about on all or appropriate campuses? Is it up to the school district, or do you want it to be State mandated? How is this going to work?

Mr. SHUMSKY. No. It is up to the school district. Currently, we, in conjunction with the schools, have placed probation officers, but it has been solely a county pay. Right now, Supervisor Molina, and the other board members, due to the fiscal constraints, are asking for those jurisdictions which want probation officers to provide a match. Currently, we have 10 jurisdictions which still provide a match, including Inglewood and Compton, and Paramount. Unfortunately, LA Unified, which has a problem with safety, also has budget problems. So, we hope to extend it on either a Federal, county, State match; but we think it is a common problem, and we respect the job that the teachers are doing and the schools are

doing. We only hope that we can help them in some manner, since we do have a common problem.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Certainly. Thank you.

Mr. SHUMSKY. Thank you.

Mr. BECERRA. Let me continue, Mr. Shumsky, with some of the questions that Ms. Woolsey was asking and ask you what are—if you can identify say the two or three components that make programs successful, what would they be? So tnat, when we look out there to fund programs, what are the things that we should be looking at that make a program really work?

Mr. SHUMSKY. Well, a camp program works because we can give the incarcerated minors undivided attention. The choices are not there. The minors have a choice between positive alternatives. We can return them, I think, with enhanced self-esteem. This represents really the first success for most of those kids. If you had the opportunity to attend our graduation, it is remarkable that the youngsters take it very seriously, as do the parents. It marks an initial success which, in about 60 percent of the graduates, it stands them in good stead for years to come. Recidivism is 40 percent, or lack thereof is 60 percent. So, we say we are 60 percent successful.

Mr. BECERRA. Ms. Griffith, a question for you. Again, congratulations on being instrumental in getting that child care center open. I know it was a tough road. It is always a tough road when you do something like that. It just seems unfortunate though that when it comes to child care, we always neglect that area when it comes to either government or private enterprise. We just do not seem to give it the attention it deserves. We do not give, as you mentioned, the people who are actually taking care of our children, the attention they deserve.

Any ideas on what we need to do? Do we have to get to the point of credentialing—having a career ladder for people who are going to go into the field of child care, day care, preschool? What do we need to do to provide the professionalism or the attention that is needed for these individuals, so they get paid a decent wage?

Ms. GRIFFITH. I think that the education is available. What probably needs to happen is that there has to be support for teachers while they are in the education process. In the end, all of our teachers qualify immediately for our subsidies for their own children, because we know that they are very low-income teachers. That is a hard fact to get around, is when a teacher with a master's degree realizes that she just can no longer afford to do this to her family, that she has to go into an educational level at a higher rate of pay, and that she must leave early childhood education. Eventually, we are going to suffer.

Mr. BECERRA. Thank you.

I have no further questions.

Ms. Woolsey?

Ms. WOOLSEY. I am fine.

Mr. BECERRA. Well, then we are done with the panel, and we are actually done with the hearing. I would like to thank the three panelists who were here, along with the other panelists who were here for today, and also the audience for having participated. I want to make sure I thank Congresswoman Lynn Woolsey for hav-

ing come down from Northern California to be here in Los Angeles to attend this hearing with me.

We are going to continue to work on the issues involving the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. I apologize, for those of you who are in the audience who were hoping to have a chance to make some comment or ask some questions, but we are running a little late on time. I will remind you, however, that there is an opportunity to submit any questions or any comments you have for the record by writing those and sending those in to the committee, the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education, and they will be incorporated in part of the official record of these proceedings.

Again, gracias a todos por esta aqui es pero que todos se en beluqua en la processo, y es pero que todos in pies en a jotar toda tiempo.

Thank you all for being here. Again, this hearing is now concluded.

[Applause.]

[Whereupon, at 12:39 p.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]

81-152 (68)

ISBN 0-16-046062-X